For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex libris
universitatis
albertaensis

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
QUAECUMQUE VERA

University of Alberta
Printing Department

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

https://archive.org/details/Auten1961

THE NATION-STATE,
ITS RISE AND THEOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE GENERAL FACULTY COUNCIL
COMMITTEE ON BACHELOR OF DIVINITY DEGREES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
BACHELOR OF DIVINITY

By

DARRYL JAMES AUTEN, B.A.

University of Alberta

April, 1961

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Nation-State, Its Rise and Theological Significance is an attempt to review the history of our modern nation-states, and to indicate what the theologians have had to say about the state in its various stages of development. In the five chapters, five periods of development from imperial government to the individual national states are examined in their political context. Set alongside these developments are the writings of the theologians who have contributed to our understanding of God's plan for man and the state. The questions which have been asked many times in providing a basis are, "what is the function of this state? And how do the theologians see the state under God?" Thus only the factors which have had a part in the state's development have been considered in an attempt to keep the paper within manageable limits. If it seems fragmentary and telescoped, it is because of the very selective choice of materials.

CHAPTER I

EARLY DEVELOPMENTS

800-1500

The Empire of Charlemagne was not in any sense a nation state. This great man had welded together a vast number of small tribes and peoples by the power of his personality and through administrative ability. His state existed as long as he was able to administer its heterogenous territories. At his death, the centrifugal process began, first finding expression in the Treaty of Verdun 843 A.D. when an initial division into three territories took place. Three kingdoms, one Frankish, one German, and one a mixture of the Franco-German elements replaced the Empire. In the following years the division continued in a new way. Instead of additional absolute monarchs, small and large landholders began to exert more authority. Rights and privileges originally held by the monarch were given away as the price of support, or usurped in many areas, thus weakening the power of the Kings. The pressures of invading Vikings from the north and west, and from the Slavic hordes of the east were responsible in many ways for this loss of power. This is true of all the areas in which nation states were to develop, Germany, Italy, France, England. Spain presents an exception as it was under the domination of Islam.

Prior to the unique developments which gave England and France national states, the Empire of the Germans and Italians (known as the Holy Roman Empire) occupied an important position in the political growth of medieval

Europe. For although political unity was not achieved, many of the state church relationships which later affected the other states were worked out in the Empire. Of more importance, the ruling powers were subjected to many important tests. In Germany the fate of a nation under an elected monarchy was clearly demonstrated. Selling prerogatives of power for support in an election obviously weakened and eventually destroyed the crown's central power. Trans-Alpine interference and the vision of an Empire reconstituted upon the glories of ancient Rome sapped the strength of a united Germany. Emperors continually engaged in the task of maintaining control over the Latin and Teutonic peoples could never find enough time for both. Either element would have demanded a strong man. For the weak, it was impossible. When the choice had to be made, the glory of the past drew with seductive power. Germany suffered and faltered even when a strong ruler was able to handle both Germany and Italy. The intrigues of the Italian power-hunters produced a time and money consuming distraction. Much of Germany's wealth was drawn to the south to the exclusion of a growing consolidated Germany. The total result was that by the middle of the thirteenth century all possibilities of building a German national state were gone. All that was left was a titular head who ruled one of the many smaller states within the Empire.

The validation of the position to which Germany and the Empire came in this early period may be seen by a summary

of the events which produced the disintegration of the Empire.

The decay of Charlemagne's empire has been noted and explained by the diverse elements over which he ruled. Following the Treaty of Verdun (843 A.D.) a main cause of the decentralizing tendency was the struggle between Emperors and Pope. Each of these two rulers sought to control wholly the lives of the people under him. The Emperor in the tradition of David, King of Israel, and Constantine, Emperor of Rome, sought to exert control over church and state. The Pope, emphasizing the supreme power given to him by Christ as a successor of Peter, sought to realize a similar claim. For centuries no distinction was made between the two spheres of influence, secular and sacred. The result was a long and bitter struggle between Pope and Emperor beginning with Nicholas I (858-867) and culminating in Boniface VIII (1294-1303). Not until the claims of both were recognized to exist in separate spheres, did any measure of peace come. Yet when the differences were recognized and peace was established, a new entity had begun to emerge which was neither imperial nor papist in character, but transcended both in the loyalty of its citizens. This was the nation-state. But before we turn to analyze the growth of the nation-state, let us look at the struggle of the church and empire very briefly.

Nicholas I (858-867) was the Father of papal claims to authority in the Middle Ages. In seeking to actualize Augustine's view of the church seen in the City of God, Nicholas proved to be the ablest and most assertive

occupant of the Papal office between Gregory the Great and Hildebrand. His program was of such stature that his claims were hardly ever exceeded, requiring centuries for realization. Nicholas assumed and attempted to uphold the superiority of the church in all areas, it being superior to every other power. Of the church, the pope was the master, the Bishops his liege servants ready to carry out his command. Though these prerogatives were claimed, only in a few instances did he carry them out. Theitberga, estranged wife of Lothar II of Lorraine sued and won the right to be restored to Lothar through the intervention of Nicholas. Two archbishops who had supported Lothar, were excommunicated and brought to heel, over the objections of the Emperor. Thus in one stroke, the Emperor and his vassal were chastised, two high church prelates put down, and innocent womanhood was protected.

A successor of Nicholas I, John VIII (872-882) sought to enforce the ideals established by Nicholas. In the last year of his reign, John crowned the emperor, thus establishing a precedent later to be much practiced by the popes. In his act, John conferred the Imperial insignia on Charles the Bold against the wishes expressed by the deceased Emperor's will.

The Pope's power, growing towards world sovereignty, was checked by the forces which made possible his enhanced position. When the empire was a strong ruling force, the Popes had an opportunity to assert their influence; when the Empire was weak there was no secular arm to maintain order, or obey the commands of the Papacy. For the century

and one half following John VIII, the powers of the papacy were not fully used. Corruption, simony, nicolaitanism, and other diseases crippled the powers of this great institution. The Empire at the same time went through similar disintegration and renewal as minor feudal municipalities gained power and organized into the various kingdoms of the Germans. The eleventh century saw a revitalization of both empire and church.

Under Henry III (1039-1056) the power of an Empire was expressed. Reforms were made in the church and in government at home. The condition of the papacy was such that in 1046 three separate popes made claims to power. Henry, who was under the influence of the reform movement of Cluny, undertook in 1046 to clean up the papacy by holding a synod in which the three Popes were deposed or forced to resign. In Leo IX (1049-1054) the papacy was firmly controlled by the reforming elements. Strong effective leadership now existed in the church and in the state; the struggle for power entered a new phase.

Lay investiture became the issue in the struggle which lasted for the following fifty years, as both church and Empire sought to exert the supreme authority over the lives of men. Henry IV (1056-1106) and Gregory VII (1073-1085), the main figures of the struggle were determined to control the appointments of prelates to the higher offices of the church. Since these higher offices entailed both secular and spiritual functions the claims of both were valid, the

crisis devolving about first loyalties rather than any other issue. In the struggle each party was so determined to control the other that every force was used to beat down the opponent. In 1075 in answer to a letter of denunciation from a German synod under Henry IV's direction, Gregory excommunicated and deposed Henry. In 1076 at Canossa, Henry made his contrite submission to Gregory and was absolved. In this act Henry seemed to admit that the Pope had won. Four years later however, Henry extended his ecclesiastical appointments and defied the Papal decrees, challenging his defeat and humiliation of 1076. Once again he was excommunicated. In this situation Henry had Germany behind him. He defied Gregory, leading a force which captured Rome and drove the Pope out. In 1085 Gregory died and for the next fifteen years two Popes disputed hotly for right to be successor of Gregory. So Henry's humiliation at Canossa was in a small part undone by his vigorous action in the following years.

But the struggle continued. In the next century Frederick Barbarossa (1156-1190) ruled as a strong Emperor over the Germans. His death opened the way for a revitalized clergy to intrigue for an Emperor who would obey Papal dictates. Frederick's successor was short lived, and when finally Frederick II (1212-1250) was put forward, Innocent II (1198-1216) thought he had finally found a perfect candidate. For Innocent was a man of many gifts. He had used power politics to play off the many rivals for the Imperial office until he was ready with an acceptable man. But Innocent's successors

were not so pleased with Frederick who was anything but submissive. He ran his kingdom as an efficient state, regardless of prince or Pope. But his main concern was in Italy and Sicily. Germany found herself with an absent Emperor. The kingdoms of Germany moved toward absolute soverignty greatly aided by the freedom which Frederick gave and the gifts of rights and lands he lavished. At his death, the intrigues of the Popes helped to prevent his heir from inheriting the Imperial dignities.

Thus the Italian interests of the Emperor, his lavish grants of land and rights, the elected monarchy which required such grants of favor for support, and the intrigues of the See of Rome all became factors in the failure of the kingdom of the Germans. Not for six hundred years was Germany to come into its own as a national state.

At the same time, the factors which kept Germany, Italy and especially the Pope in Italy preoccupied, allowed for freedom in France and England. And when the possibilities of Germany ever becoming powerful and united were exhausted, the two kingdoms of the west came alive to fill the power vacuum left by Germany's collapse.

In France the invasions of the Vikings in the ninth and tenth centuries caused the rise of a feudal state which left the king effective ruler over a small area in and around Paris. By the middle of the twelfth century an expansion process had begun in which the French king absorbed neighboring territories or drew them in by marriage and conquest. Upon the accession of Philip Augustus the territories under

his control included the area around Paris, Brittany, Poitou, and Normandy, and he was assured the obedience of the Count of Flanders. Under Louis VIII (1223-1226) the County of Toulouse was annexed. His reign was short, and an infant son Louis IX (1226-1270) became king. The regent council maintained his kingdom intact, and his power advanced over the diverse elements of the kingdom. Under Louis many advances were made toward the realization of a unified country under one monarch. His great contributions were to further the reforms of administration and the national government begun by his grandfather Philip Augustus. In the Parlement and its offices the means of carrying out measures deemed best for the country slowly developed. "Private wars were abolished, personal serfdom was abolished on the royal domains, the judicial system was completed by the organization of an instance of appeal, and taxation was rendered more equitable." 1) Trial by ordeal was replaced by crown justice, and tax paying became more equitable as a Chamber of Accounts was established. The government was becoming an agency of protection, not exaction and suppression. The crown became more popular because of its justice and tolerance, the national spirit thus growing in this gratitude toward the King. But whereas Louis was a peace-loving king, gracious to foe and friend alike, his successors were soon to prove their political prowess and desire for expansion. In the north and east the attempts to regain what had been granted at Verdun brought France into conflict with the Empire. And mounting strength,

---

1) Pirenne. A History of Europe. p 338

time and circumstances gave France the advantage as the borders slowly moved east. In the south this was not the case, as the Pyrenees provided a cultural as well as a physical barrier. By the end of the thirteenth century the monarchy had gained prestige, the country was larger than ever before and more prosperous.

The next two centuries in the history of France as a rapidly developing national state witnessed a series of struggles with England and of a consolidation of authority within the country. In conflict with Boniface VIII (1294-1303) Philip the Fair repudiated all the claims registered by the Pope to world sovereignty. Boniface was not a new and original thinker who sought to shape the life of the church to existing times. He was a collector in that he gathered all the decrees of the past on the church-state relationship and attempted to force them on a different situation. The States General and the King, Philip, rapidly repudiated such claims, as did Edward I King of England and his Parliament. Now Papal power had found not a single opponent in the Empire, but two formidable opponents in the French and English kingdoms. For it was not just a King he opposed, but aroused national prerogatives which Boniface was treading upon. He was checked and no official papal decree was to come again to try to overpower a king as Gregory did at Canossa.

In the further expansion of France, a continuous struggle with England ensued until the middle of the fifteenth century when the last stronghold fell to the French. In the court the kings worked out their administration through a

council of personal advisors. Their responsibility was in the area of foreign service and major policies at home. In the government of the home territories slowly being acquired, provosts like the English bailiffs, baillis and senechaux who were like sheriffs, and enqueteurs who were responsible for travelling the land on inspection trips, made up the lower levels of the government. All these men were responsible to the Chambre des Comptes and Parlement, the former being a fiscal agency and the latter a supreme court. Thus from the local government to the higher courts, France provided a strong government based upon a national grouping of people loyal to the monarch.

A different process produced the same results in England, and gave deeper roots for stable society. Owing to the foresight of William the Conqueror there were few fiefs in England whose population was not directly subject to him. The administration was built up using the shires as a basic unit of government. Subordinate officials ruled over hundreds, subject to the sheriff who collected and administered the revenues. Other agencies during the following four centuries were developed for the administration of justice, external and internal affairs. At this time most of the forms of modern government with which we are familiar grew up out of custom and expediency. A new outlook toward the nation and one of the most characteristic features of the nation-state came into being now also. It was the emergence of a national policy at home and abroad. The

parliamentary right of taxation, and of giving assent to laws made by the crown, made it possible for the king and the nation to be associated in the government of the kingdom. So the powers and rights wrested from John Lackland in the Magna Charta (1215) were confirmed and complemented by other national claims. In 1297 the right of Parliament to grant monies and collect taxes was obtained; in 1351 to counter external interference the Statute of Provisors was passed. There was to be no papal interference in the election of Bishops. Praemunire, a statute of 1353, forbade appeal beyond the borders of England. Though these articles were dead letters they indicate the spirit of independence which was becoming more apparent by 1366 as parliament refused to recognize the pope's right to grant England as a papal fief. Truly England developed through this period an outlook and policy which was English in character. Of this happy wedding of kingly prerogatives and Parliamentary rights and support Pirenne comments:

> Although the personal power of the prince was subjected to definite limitations, and although, alone among his European peers, he had to renounce the possibility of waging wars inspired by mere dynastic ambition, and apply himself solely to enterprizes approved and subsidized by his people, yet on the other hand, what strength he gained from this compliance! From the end of the 13th century the English policy was truly ... a national policy ... where the enterprises of the Crown were necessarily those of the nation." 2)

---

2) Pirenne Ibid p. 359

* * * *

Theological interpretations of the relationship of the state and the church arose from many sources all through the Middle Ages. The primary concern came from the papacy, and later from the scholars at the universities and other centres of learning. The reasons for the Papacy's early leadership may be accounted for by the position which the See of Rome occupied in the rising and falling fortunes of the western Empire and Emperors. After each decline in Imperial power and western order the Papacy often remained as the one leader in the community to which men could turn for guidance. In times of pontifical decadence the previous glories remained with the office until another renewal should lift it to new eminence. For the history of papal growth in power is characterized by an upsurge of power and claims, then a waning of influence. Progressive stages brought the Pope to heights of power which were never lost until they culminated in the reign of Innocent III. Thereafter influences from many sources prevented the extension of the papal prerogatives, thereby allowing many diverse teachings on the state-church relationship to flourish. Our responsibility here is to examine the claims and results of the Pope's claims in the era from Nicholas I to Boniface VIII, and the thoughts of church scholars in this whole relationship.

The claims of the Popes appear to us to be extravagant and out of line with the so-called spiritual office which they exercised. In Nicholas I many claims were made, few of

which ever succeeded, yet which set the basis for later claims and success. The acceptance of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals 3) by Nicholas greatly strengthened his position. A letter Preposueramus quidem (865) to the Emperor Michael sets forth Nicholas' position most clearly.

> . . . The judge shall not be judged neither by Augustus, nor by any cleric, nor by the people .. The First See shall not be judged by any . . . The higher authority of the court against whose judgements a complaint is laid, the greater must be the eminence of that court whose decision is sought, until by stages that See is reached whose decision is either ammended by itself, the deserts of the case so compelling, or is reserved for the judgement of God alone, without further question. 4)

It was two centuries later that the basic claims asserted by Nicholas I were gathered in one man and asserted again. The freshening breeze of reform in the Papal household brought Hildebrand into power as Pope (1073-1085). One of the most dynamic and striking figures of the Middle Ages, Hildebrand as Gregory VII, viewed the papacy as the divinely appointed universal sovereignty which all men must obey. All earthly sovereigns were to be responsible to him, not only for the spiritual welfare of the people, but in respect of good government. Several statements from a paper by Cardinal Deusdedit - Dictatus Papae illustrate very

---

3) Purporting to have been prepared by the Emperor Constantine, the donation of Constantine was a document which gave to Pope Sylvester I and his successors jurisdiction over the city of Rome and the western regions. Though a forgery, the deception went unnoticed until it was proven false by Lorenzo Valla in the 15th century.

4) Bettenson - Documents of the Christian Church p.131

clearly Gregory's position. "That the Roman church was founded by God alone." "That theRoman pontiff alone can with right be called universal." "That he alone can depose or reinstate bishops." "That he alone may use (i.e. dispose of) the Imperial insignia." "That it may be permitted him to depose emperors." "That he may absolve subjects from their fealty to wicked men." 5) His claims and ideals envisaged world rulership. In a letter to Hermann, Archbishop of Metz in 1081 Gregory tried to emphasize his claim to authority basing it upon Peter's possession of the keys. As a successor of Peter, he felt justified in making Rome the supreme authority. Ann Fremantle's The Papal Encyclicals summarizes Gregory's position in this letter to Hermann, concerning the Pope's responsibility toward a ruler. Gregory clearly indicates: "(1) that the spiritual power is superior to the temporal power, being derived from God himself, whereas the temporal power generally originates in despicable human passions;(2) that kings and emperors, like any other of the faithful, can be punished by ecclesiastical penalties including excommunication;(3) that the superiority of the spiritual to the temporal power implies the right of judging the rulers for their temporal activities;(4) that the papal right to bind and loose can be used against a guilty ruler and that it can absolve his subjects from their allegiance."6) Gregory's determined policy toward the Empire and Henry IV bears out completely his views expressed here and by Cardinal Deusdidit.

---

5) Walker - W.A.History of the Christian Church. p.229
6) p.61

It was in thefollowing century that the Papal office made and enforced claims of supremacy over the rulers of the world. In 1170 Henry II, King of England was forced to do homage before the papal legates for his part in the murder of Thomas à Becket. The real power came to bear in Innocent III (1198-1216) however. As noted already, he controlled the election of the Holy Roman Emperor and forced King John to do homage for his kingdom as a papal fief. The height of papal claims and gains were reached in him. Walker says, "Innocent III was unquestionably a man of personal humility and piety, but no Pope ever had higher conceptions of the papal office and under him the papacy reached its highest actual power."7)

Innocent's view of his position is summed up in his letter to Acerbus, a noble of Tuscany dated November3, 1198. Called Sicut Universitatis conditor the letter expresses the view that there are the two powers over the souls of men, the Pope and theEmperor just as there is the sun and moon. The Pope rules the spiritual part of man as he corresponds to the power of the sun, the Emperor is equivalent to the moon, a lesser light ruling the night of men, their bodies. The Emperor, like the moon,reflects light from a greater light the Pope who is ruler over the lesser power. To support this belief a world state was organized "with its judiciary and its laws, its centralized

---

7) Walker Ibid pp. 286-287

bureaucracy, its financial system and its armies, prepared to coerce by force of arms, by the threat and reality of holy war, any rebellion against the standard doctrine of belief and conduct or against the papal policies." 8) Though the claims were later to be expressed in orderly fashion, we see in Innocent the practical culmination of papal prerogatives and achievement of them. Though the succeeding Popes used their various talents to end finally the power of the German Emperors, none succeeded as Innocent did.

The last and fullest voice to express claims of superiority was that of Boniface VIII (1294-1303). Upon the defeat of Philip IV King of France in battle, Boniface issued a Bull of great import for his time and the future. All claims became one in Unam Sanctam, issued in 1296, for it was the last to express the absolutist views of papal power.

> Both swords, the spiritual and the material, therefore, are in the power of the church; the one by the hand of the priest, the other by the hand of the kings and knights, but at the will and sufferance of the priest. One sword ought to be under the other, and the temporal authority to be subjected to the spiritual . . . Whoever, therefore, resists this power thus ordained by God, resists the ordination of God . . . Indeed we declare, announce and define, that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff. 9)

As we shall now see the Pope's claims of superiority in all aspects over civil governments and people were not

---

8) Fremantle Ibid pp. 69-70

9) Fremantle Ibid p. 73-74

universally shared.

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) the spiritual father of Roman Catholicism was very guarded in his statements on the powers of the Pope. He agreed that the secular authority was subordinate to the spiritual power, but only in spiritual matters. In matters of state business the rulers were not to be interfered with except as it affected the spiritual welfare of the people.

In opposition to the supremacy of the Popes was William of Ockham (d. 1349). He saw two spheres of influence, the Pope supreme in the spiritual and the Emperor in the temporal. The dignity of the church was certainly greater, but both institutions were ordained to exist side by side neither interfering in the other. Unusual circumstances such as a tyrannical Emperor or a heretical Pope could conceivably have called for the judgement of one upon the other. William's concern was to work to his utmost for the independence of the state from ecclesiastical authority.

The extremist of the era, however, was Marsilius of Padua, a canon of the church in Padua. In 1324 Marsilius produced a treatise on politics which attacked the political power of the Pope as evil. The state, as he saw it was based upon Aristotle's Politics and exists for the good of the people. The authority of the state exists in the group of electors, the "legislator", not in any individual group. His ideal was an elected monarchy such as he saw in the Holy Roman Empire of his time. This monarch would rule by

the consent of the people, would appoint officials including higher and lower clergy. As the Popes saw their role as sole rulers over all, Marsilius pictured the Emperor supreme ruler in a caesaropapist state. The state, being supreme, has the right to rule the church, but there is no corresponding right for the church to rule the state. In his treatise Defensor pacis, Marsilius came to many conclusions regarding this relationship. Conclusion:

8. The "legislator" alone or the one who rules by its authority has the power to dispense with human laws.

9. The elective principality or other office derives its authority from the election of the body having the right to elect, and not from the confirmation or approval of any other power.

10. The election of any prince or other official, especially one who has coercive power, is determined solely by the expressed will of the legislator.

11. There can be only one supreme ruling power in a state or kingdom.

13. No prince, still more, no partial council or single person of any position has full authority and control over other persons, laymen or clergy, without the authority of the legislator.

14. No bishop or priest has coercive authority or jurisdiction over any layman or clergyman, even if he is a heretic. 10)

---

10) Thatcher & McNeale - A Source Book of Medieval History pp. 318-319

In many ways Marsilius was very modern, both in his conception of government rule, and the position which the church has come to occupy.

The last figure to which we may turn for views on the religious thinking on church and state was an Englishman. John Wycliffe (1320-1384)had peculiarly feudal conceptions of the role of the ecclesiastical office. Since God is the chief overlord, all offices are from him as fiefs and offices of trust. If any cleric is unworthy, his lands should be taken away by the temporal ruler as he forfeits all claim to the office. This view of the nobles' right to seize land when unjustly administered by the clerics brought rapid condemnation from the higher authorities of the church. In London 1382 many of Wycliffe's teachings were condemned among them these which illustrate his church-state sentiments.

> 16. That temporal lords can at their will take away temporal goods from the church, when those who hold them are sinful (habitually sinful, not sinning in one act only).
> 17. That people can at their own will correct sinful lords. 11)

Similarly though more sweeping, were the results gained by his followers, the Lollards, in 1394.

> "That king and bishop in one person, prelate and judge in temporal causes, curate and officer in secular office, puts any kingdom beyond good rule. This conclusion is clearly proved because the temporal and spiritual are two halves of the entire Holy Church. And he who has applied himself to one should not meddle with the other, for

---

11) Bettenson Ibid p. 244

> no one can serve two masters. . . . we do petition before Parliament that all curates, as well superior as inferior, be fully excused and should occupy themselves with their own charge and no other. 12)

Here then was the final charge made by the religious thinkers on the church-state relationship in the Middle Ages. Though the earlier views expressed centred on the church-empire relationship, no major emphasis was ever made in reference to the nation-states as such. Perhaps their unique positions as unidentified entities, and slowly gathering forms allowed them certain freedoms from criticism.

---

12) Ibid, p. 247.

CHAPTER II

THE REFORMATION ERA

1500-1648

The political shape of Europe by 1500 was varied and complex. In and through the reform movement new systems took shape; old ones were consolidated and expanded. It is to these developments that our attention turns in this section.

In Germany the political development hinged largely upon Luther's revolt from Rome, and the eventual reaction to this revolt. In the early sixteenth century, Germany was a vast collection of large and small autonomous states. The Empire existed with an elected emperor, but an emperor in name only. As the events of the sixteenth century were to prove, this titular leadership was completely ineffective, for each principality went its own way. For each little state was ruled by a prince, duke, count, prelate or some other feudal leader, responsible in theory for supporting the emperor. In reality, support was assured only when it did not conflict with the interests of the prince.

For the people who lived under the rulers of these principalities, as varied a mixture of conditions as states prevailed. In general the southern part of Germany was more advanced than the north with regard to the liberation of the masses. In the south the people were freer, held land, were fairly prosperous, and were seeking advantages politically. In the north, the common people were still at the level of serfdom. During the Reformation this difference in conditions was an important factor in German development. For when the Peasants' Revolt came in 1525 it was largely

the revolt of the more enlightened south German peasantry. We cannot go into detail here,however, because the revolt was a very complex affair. We can see that when Luther reacted so violently against the Peasants' Revolt, he caused the practically complete alienation of this progressive peasantry. Further gains for a South German Protestant cause were frustrated from that time onwards, and Lutheranism was confined to the north and west.

The years following the Peasants' Revolt saw Germany split into two armed camps which eventually came to blows in 1546-47 in the Schmalkaldic War. The Emperor and his allies defeated and crushed Saxony, a stronghold of Lutheranism. In 1552 however, the tide was turned in favor of the Lutherans in an equally sweeping defeat. By the Peace of Augsburg (1555) the victory gave new security to the Lutheran cause. "By the side of the old church an imperial law for the first time recognized a heretical departure from Catholicism called Lutheranism . . ." but "For the student of the German political development the importance of the legalization of the new faith lies in its marking a fresh victory of the territorial principle over the central power."1) From this point on, religion was to be a matter of choice for each state, and was not to be on a national basis. But by no means was the Peace of Augsburg a peace. It was a truce in the continuing struggle between the Roman

---

1) Schevill <u>A History of Europe</u> p.113

Catholic and Protestant states. In 1593 a local war was fought for the control of Aix-la-Chapelle, and in 1600 another one was fought for Cologne. During this time, in addition to the gains made by Lutheranism, the Calvinists also added to their strength even though they had no rights under the Peace of Augsburg. In 1608 the division of Germany into war camps began earnestly as a Protestant league was formed. The German Catholic states formed a league in 1609 to retaliate. At the same time pressures developed from French intrusions into territories long subject to the Empire, and from Spanish and Austrian Habsburg interests and the conflicts which they helped to develop . The end result was the Thirty Years War which ravaged Germany from 1618 until the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Of this long struggle R. R. Palmer says:

> "The Thirty Years War, resulting from all these pressures, was therefore exceedingly complex. It was a German civil war fought over the Catholic-Protestant issue. It was also a German civil war fought over constitutional issues, between the emperor striving to build up the central power of the empire and the member states struggling to maintain independence. These two civil wars by no means coincided, for Catholic and Protestant states were alike in objecting to imperial control. It was also an international war . . . with all these outsiders finding allies within Germany, on whose soil most of the battles were fought. 2)

During this same period, 1500 - 1648, the growth and

---

2) A History of the Modern World pp.122-123

development of the national state in France took a completely different form. The French kings were at first indifferent, then hostile to the cause of the reformers, so that many of the major political developments hinged upon reaction to the Reformation. In 1438 the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges had been signed between Rome and the French King which made the high prelates of France dependent upon the king. Under the leadership of Francis I (1515-1547) the privilege of granting the high church offices was confirmed by a Concordat (1516) with Leo X. Thus a great deal of freedom was enjoyed by the French king. Indifference to the affairs of a revolting monk in Germany was the general attitude of Francis I, until side effects began to interfere with the political questions in the French kingdom. The indifference of Francis was the opposite to that of his successor Henry II (1547-1559) who persecuted fiercely. Zealous Catholic that he was, however, Henry did not hesitate to join with the German Protestants to aid the expansion of his territories in the east and north. His attempts at expansion, destroying heresy, and the consolidation of his kingdom were cut short by early death, but Henry ruled over an increasingly national state.

Following the death of Henry II rival factions made bids for power which eventually resulted in a religious war that did not end until toleration was granted to the Protestants in 1598.

The character of French rule, statesmanship and

government action during this whole period was one of cooperation with Rome where possible in the destruction of heresy, yet it was also an attempt to conciliate the strong Huguenot faction when the danger of complete civil war developed. There was nothing to be gained by the French monarch turning Protestant as a lever against Rome. His autonomy was guaranteed by the Concordat of 1516. Later in the century and especially after the Edict of Nantes (1598), much was to be gained from peaceful co-existence. The King, Henry IV (1589-1610) used the newly found peace to promote the growth of industry, the rebuilding of roads, bridges, and the general strengthening of the nation. Under his successor Louis XIII (1610-1643) the rescue of France from the civil strife of the preceding century continued. Cardinal Richelieu,Louis' first minister,pressed the program of development in the nation with great vigor, leading the state for his dull and slothful master. In so far as he adjudged the program of renewal best suited for the state, Richelieu ruled with an iron hand. His main objectives came to be: 1. The distruction of the political rights which made the Huguenots almost independent of the state (while granting their religious freedom) 2. To contain the powers of the turbulent nobility. 3. To overthrow the power of the Habsburg that the glory of France might be increased. The first two aims were naturally internal, and were accomplished with relative ease. The third, that of foreign policy, was carried out with greater difficulty,

but was eventually achieved. The end result was that France became one of the main actors in the balance of power which finally prevailed at the Peace of Westphalia. Schevill sees France as the main dictator of this peace, and sums up Richelieu's achievements saying, "that he more than any other individual welded France into a solid political unit and prepared the way for her supramecy in Europe." 3)

The situation which prevailed in England was very different from that of France. The strong monarchy which ruled England was loath to accept any interference from the church or other powers outside the state. For by 1500 England, perhaps more than any other country, had come to a very real sense of national identity. In the next century and a half this was heightened giving the state a new and unique place in the lives of the people.

Under Henry VIII (1509-1547) the state assumed new authority, supplementing the prestige gained in previous centuries. Where before the king had represented sole authority in the state aided by the Parliament, he became with Henry VIII ruler over the church also. On the basis of political expediency, that of procuring a male heir, Henry induced Parliament to make a national church out of the Catholic church in England. Henry's main purpose was to secure rule over an English Catholic church. In terms of the political repercussions, it was a triumph for

---

3) Schevill Ibid., p. 214.

complete English sovereignty. Despite the reaction achieved by Mary in her five year reign (1553-1556), the growing independence and power of England continued. Under Elizabeth I (1558-1603) the power of England was enhanced. Through her clever negotiations, Elizabeth played one foreign power against another, her hand in marriage the apparent prize. At home, her consolidation of the church-state relationship continued with the strong Calvinist basis becoming more apparent. As "Supreme Governor" of the Church of England, Elizabeth pursued a course of reform and international diplomacy that brought her into conflict with the Pope and his allies. Philip II of Spain, finally exasperated by her actions, caused a force of 130 ships loaded with men to be assembled for an invasion of England. The English, showing the unity of the whole nation, gathered behind Sir Francis Drake in the destruction of the famed Spanish Armada in 1588.

The years following this defeat of the Spanish is marked in England by new developments across the world. In 1600 the East India Company for exploration and trading in India was formed. In 1620 English settlers landed at Plymouth Rock in the New World, to add to the colonies already established further south.

The early seventeenth century also witnessed in England the revival of the authority and initiative of the Parliament.

In deference to the aging Elizabeth, Parliament had withheld its complaints, but when James I (1603-1625) gained the throne the Lords of the land and the Commons were not so lenient. Distrustful of both James and Charles I, his successor, Parliament refused to grant adequate revenues. Under James, the problems of state were not great enough to cause civil strife. But under Charles, who from 1628 sought to rule without Parliament, taxes were imposed without Parliament consent, and other measures soon brought open revolt in Scotland (1637). After eleven years Parliament was again summoned in 1640, but was soon dissolved by Charles. With Oliver Cromwell leading the Parliamentary forces the King and Parliament came to open war, and the King was defeated. Thus began the Long Parliament, a rule of the nation by the Puritan leaders of England for the next twenty years (1640-1660).

In the Low Countries, the Netherlands, the sixteenth century was the era of a religious political upheaval which eventually produced independence for the seven northern provinces of this region. When the revolt began in 1556 it was not a revolution of a nation but of a group of states who were seeking to maintain their sovereignty against intruders wishing to impose Spanish rule. It wasn't until later that a Dutch nationality grew up to help form a nation state of the seven provinces of the northern low countries.

Going from the Low Countries to the Alps, we see a

similar group of states growing throughout the Reformation era to form the country now known as Switzerland. At the beginning of the period, this territory was a number of individual semi-independent cantons. Each had its own government, of the lower feudal nobility, a bishop, or a sort of council. Geneva as an example had three forms of government by which the territory was ruled. There was the bishop; his "vice dominus", or temporal administrator; and the citizens, who met annually in a General Assembly and chose four "syndics" and a treasurer. In addition to the General Assembly the citizens were ruled by a little Council of twenty-five, of which the "syndics" of the year and of the year previous were also members. Through the reforming currents and the activities of Guillaume Farel, a French reformer from Dauphine, the bishop of Geneva was driven out. Geneva thus became a small relatively independent community. The canton was thenceforth governed by the General Assembly, and had this form of government when Calvin arrived in 1536.

The development of the Spanish kingdom through this period is one of great interest. The reconquest of the Iberian peninsula had begun in the thirteenth century from several centres of resistance to Muslim rule. The important point for this period comes with the marriage to Ferdinand of Castile and Isabella of Aragon in 1469. Into this union came the two major Spanish kingdoms. For Spain, Isabella, and her deep Catholic piety produced a reforming element

within the land and the Catholic church there. In 1478 the Inquisition was introduced to begin the needed reform of the clergy and the laity. The worst part was the expulsion of both Jews and Moors who would not become Christians; for the better part, it began to produce a more enlightend clergy. So at the turn of the fifteenth century the church was being renewed under vigorous leadership. Scholarship advanced through such men as Ximenes who produced an excellent version of the Greek New Testament. Externally, Spain advanced in submission and loyalty to the Pope.

During the period 1500-1648 we see the splendour of the country riding the wave of newly found prosperity in the New World. Columbus discovered America under Spanish sponsorship in 1492, and within fifteen years the wealth of this new land was flooding Europe through Spain. But by the expulsion of the Moors and Jews, Spain had become impoverished by way of tradesmen and the middle class merchant society. Emigration in large numbers to colonize the new world for the homeland added to the losses. In Spain the gold caused inflation for the poor, and produced excesses in living habits among the nobility and the royalty. Thus as far as the state was concerned, there was a constant denuding of power and health during the 16th century. By 1598 and the death of Philip II, a creeping dry rot left the country in a state of collapse from which it has never recovered, even though the military strength of the nation went on for another half century.

* * * *

Martin Luther throughout his career was a man dedicated to a recovery of the truth of his religion. That Luther was a religious worker first and a politician second needs some explaining, because many people assume that the contradictions in his political tracts make of him a fool. Throughout his stormy career he was a man of religion, and he was not primarily concerned with the politics of the land. But when the politics conflicted with his religious reform, he used the strongest possible language in denunciation of the conflicting tendencies. Often where there seemed to be conflicts in his thinking, or where he repudiated his own position, the goal which he had set before him of reform or renewal was the basis upon which the contradiction rested. The statements which he issued were usually his answers to contemporary, concrete situations, so that an answer he gave in one situation was not applicable in another. At the same time some very general patterns of thought may be seen in his ideas on the state-church relationship.

Let us see first, his general ideas then go to the concrete situations with which he had to deal.

Generally speaking, Luther saw the state as the authority ordained by God for the maintenance of a disciplined society. As the father rules the household, so the prince must be the final authority in the state. Since the father will use his fist to maintain order, and the minister will use his power of speech in demands for justice, the state must use the sword to discipline its members. For this

purpose, hanging, breaking on the wheel, and any other means of maintaining order were quite permissible, just as a Doctor may have to amputate an arm to save the rest of the body from destruction.

In terms of a godly rule, Luther saw no place for a theocracy. There must be a separation of the church and the state, for when church and state are joined together one must dominate. But in making the temporal power superior to the spiritual, he left a weakness in the Lutheran cause in the form of caesaropapism. For Luther had taken away the government of the church, Pope, bishops, and priests in the technical sense. Since the princes were the highest powers in the realm, they came to be the chief administrators of the church. Then as the administrators of the church, they became "emergency bishops" so to speak, in the emergency situation. The position has remained, however, as the norm for the Lutheran states as a department of the state government, beyond the extremity out of which it was created.

The third thing we may notice generally about the ideas of Luther is his emphasis upon Christian liberty, and the right of a Christian to rebel against governments. "Christian liberty . . . was an internal freedom, purely spiritual, known only to God. In worldly matters, he said, the good Christian owes perfect obedience to established authority. Lutheranism, more than Catholicism and more than Calvinism which soon arose, come to hold the state in a kind of religious awe as an institution almost sacred in

its own right." [4] Christian liberty was only inward, for the only type of rebellion which Luther could tolerate was civil disobedience. Later in his career he was to take a more liberal stand toward violence as he gave approval to rebellion if it caused less evil than that which it was trying to correct. Also in the light of the feudal background which prevailed in Germany, he also saw the possibility of appeals to an overlord in times of injustice.

Specifically, Luther condemned claims of superiority asserted by the church, and the resulting interference in the government. His challenge to the interfering practices was delivered in The Address to the German Nobility. He says that the mistake which the popes make is thinking . . "that the Pope, bishops, priests, and monks are the spiritual estate, whereas princes, lords, laborers, and peasants are of the temporal estate . . . But all Christians are really of the spiritual estate and there is no difference except of office, . . . for we were all made priests by baptism . . a higher consecration than any that Pope or bishop gives . . . Now one may see how Christian is their law that the temporal authority has no right to punish the spiritual . . . wherefore the temporal powers of Christendom should freely exercise their office, not regarding whether it is Pope, bishop, or priest that they punish, but only that the guilty

---

4) Palmer R.R. A History of the Modern World p. 72

suffer." [5] Further on in the tract to the nobility Luther makes specific his challenges about the presumption of the clergy and the Pope. "Bishops should be invested by the civil magistrate as in France and not obliged to swear allegiance to the Pope. The Pope should claim no authority over the Emperor, whom he should crown only as a bishop does a king. No legal cause should be appealed to Rome. Each prince should forbid annates." [6] It may be noted that each of these claims seeks to enhance the powers of the temporal ruler to the exclusion of the church's claims in temporal matters.

The Peasants' Revolt proved to be the source of the most violent statements made by Luther regarding the state. In an exhortation to the peasants themselves, Luther tried to dissuade them from any forms of violence: "It is my friendly and fraternal prayer, dearest brothers, to be very careful what you do . . . Those who take the sword shall perish by the sword and every soul should be subject to the powers that be, in fear and honor. If the government is bad and intolerable, that is no excuse for riot and insurrection, for to punish evil belongs not to every one, but to the civil authority which bears the sword. [7]

Failing in this appeal and with no blows yet struck for order, Luther turned to the princes in a treatise aimed

---

5) Smith, P. Martin Luther p. 80-81.
6) Smith Ibid p. 83.
7) Smith Ibid p. 159.

at restoring authority and peace. In his tract Against the Thieving, Murderous Hordes of Peasants he made these bold, bloody statements:

' "The peasants have deserved death for three reasons: (1) because they have broken their oath of fealty; (2) for rioting and plundering; and (3) for having covered their terrible sins with the name of the gospel." Wherefore, my lords, free, save, help, and pity the poor people; stab, smite, and slay all that you can. If you die in battle you could never have a more blessed end, for you die obedient to God's word in Romans 13, and in service of love to free your neighbor from the bands of hell and the devil . . . Let none think this too hard who considers how intolerable is rebellion.' [8)]

The result of Luther's violent attack was the repudiation of his cause by many. Yet he goes on in the months following the crushing of the Revolt to defend his position by asserting the absolute need for order and authority. For without this order he saw the immediate collapse of all that had been accomplished. In a letter to Nicholas Amsdorf of Magdeburg he writes:

> My opinion is that it is better that all the peasants be killed than that the princes and magistrates perish, because the rustics took the sword without divine authority . . . Even if the princes abuse their power, yet they have it of God, and under their rule the kingdom of God at least has a chance to exist. [9)]

---

8) Ibid p. 162-163.
9) Ibid p. 164.

Under the pressures of the resurgent Catholicism, Luther came to a different frame of mind. Whereas he had condemned the peasant's action in revolt, when it came to the preservation of his gains, he was inclined to let the lawyers argue the legality of revolt against the Emperor. He saw the need for a strong force for the reforming group, and was not prepared to haggle over the rightness of such a union opposed to the imperial control. As it turned out, political expediency, rather than any predetermined plan of action, was the basis of his view. Each crisis that Luther faced and dealt with in politics had this element in it, of the expedient action for the best results in the reform movement.

The other major theological position on the nature of state-church relationships is that arising from the work and thought of John Calvin. As we saw earlier, Calvin entered Geneva to find a city governed by a General Assembly of the people and their elected representatives. This of course influenced his thinking somewhat, but his thinking was more responsible for making changes in the existing forms. Tillich makes some broad generalizations which will help to point up some of the trends in Calvin's thought. He says . . . "that a theocracy has to be established, i.e., a government which (is) not a priestly government, but the rule of God through the application of the evangelical laws, through the political

---

LIBRARY OF THE

situation . . . And he demands that the magistrates of Geneva care not only for legal problems, the problems of order in the general sense, but also . . . for the church;" 10)

"For this reason indeed, Calvin's thought about the state strongly rejects these political theories of the Renaissance which would have given a purely secular foundation to the state, and to the right of the monarch." 11) Calvin went with Luther in saying that the church and state were divinely ordained, and each had its own spheres of responsibility. The sovereign power was to exercise its authority not out of its own interests but in an effort to help the people. How opposed this attitude is to the Lutheran state where the government often meant restriction ratherthan help. As far as the individual Christian is concerned in this Calvinistic state, he is to help remake society into the image of a religious community. The people were to grow into disciplined and saintly lives, with the kings themselves doing the Lord's work.

Even with the desire to remake the state into a godly community the Calvinist never looked upon the state with veneration. The state and government was always subject to the moral judgement of God. The moral judgement was then enacted by the work of the people. Calvin thus left the door open for rebellion, the rebellion of the lower magistrates whose duty it was to maintain good government. In the western countries this has taken the form of government

---

10) Tillich, Paul, A History of Christian Thought.
11) Whale, J.S. The Protestant Tradition p. 308.

changed at the will of the people by popular vote. For when the state government fails in its obligations it must be replaced by one that will. The change then becomes the fulfillment of the judgement.

Theodore Beza (1519-1609) Calvin's capable successor developed Calvin's view of the nature of the state and the function of government. He saw the people as the ultimate source of law when all other appeals break down. Violent revolution is quite acceptable if no other means are left, because the authorities are bound to the natural law as are the people. When they break the law then the people are bound to repudiate them by any means possible. It implies the sovereignty of the people, and the binding nature of a constitution. To quote Ernst Troeltsch:

> Beza's theory is still a compromise between the doctrines of the Divine nature of authority which supports, and carries forward, the process of history under the guidance of God, and of the Christian duty of passive obedience enjoined by the Bible, with Calvinistic individualism and its rational ideal of Society . . . summed up in the phrase, "We must obey God rather than man." 12)

In Beza came the general summation of early Calvinistic thought, at any rate, all that is included in this period.

As for the Roman Catholic view of the state at this time, there seems to be little that can be gathered. Spain certainly represents the state most obviously devout in its affiliation

---

12) The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches p. 630

with Rome. But in Spain, as in France, there existed concordats with Rome which gave the state practical control over the church. In all areas the church governed itself, and with the abuses of pre-reform days gone there wasn't too much that the state had to do, except to act as the sword for the church. Perhaps the preoccupation with the New World produced distraction enough to prevent extensive thought on the theology of the church-state relationship.

The last major figure to be considered in connection with this era is the well known author of state-craft, Machiavelli. Born in 1469 in Florence, Niccolo Machiavelli was a diplomatist for the city of Florence for a thirteen year period from 1498-1511 while the powers of government rested in hands other than the Medici's. Ousted from his position, Machiavelli retired to a small estate near Florence to live in relative peace until his death in 1527. During this exile he composed a work which was to be very important three hundred years later, but which was banned by the church thirty years after its first publication in 1532.

In The Prince, Machiavelli discussed the purpose of the state, the source of power, the basis on which power may be manipulated and used, and gives general directives to men who would aspire to power. Christian Gauss, who has written an excellent introduction to the book, indicates that The Prince became for nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a handbook of one road to political power, citing Lenin, Stalin, Lord Acton and others as examples of those

who have studied it.

Machiavelli speaks to a later age then, not because his own age could not understand him, but because they did not appreciate what he said. For the Florentines his work was one of judgement declaring that the day of the republic was past, for the time being at least. The absolute monarch was the only hope for the future, for only a single strong ruler could bring the masses under a single common law. Gauss sums up Machiavelli's position saying: "The state is no longer an instrument for achieving the good life. It has become a dynamic, amoral entity, a force . . . It is only slight exaggeration to say that the role of the prince is to direct this force according to principles which in essence are very much like those by which the scientist directs the course of the guided missile. There is no inherent purpose in the state. Any direction it may receive must be imposed on it by the ruler." 13)

So for Machiavelli, the ruler gave guidance to the state. The people did not count for much other than to carry out the ruler's will for their own good. This autocratic basis had to be enforced in any manner, and so forceful tactics, cunning and treachery were permissable. It is no wonder his work came under the ban as men sought new outlets of action hitherto restricted by the developing centralized monarchies. We may explain also the use of The Prince later, as men sought to unify their nations, as in Italy and Germany, and turned to

---

13) Machiavelli The Prince Introd. C. Gauss p. 16

LIBRARY OF THE

the means most likely to produce results. One group rejected Machiavelli during their era; the other hailed him as the master of their destinies.

LIBRARY OF THE

CHAPTER III

THE AGE OF ABSOLUTISM

1648-1789

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

The development of the French Nation-state during this period was toward the rule of an absolute monarch. These tendencies toward absolutism begun by Cardinal Richelieu under Louis XIII, were carried forward by his successor Cardinal Mazarin until the majority of Louis XIV. The result of this royal effort was the gathering of the lines of power into the king's hands. It also meant that all government business was channeled through the king's court. Institutions which might have been aiding the king in governing the land were passed by to become useless vestiges of the past. Under an able king such as Louis XIV the greater problems were dealt with in some measure of efficiency. But under his successors, Louis XV and Louis XVI the centrality and absolutist tendencies caused the nation to flounder more and more until it collapsed into the French Revolution.

The end of the absolutism of Louis XIV may be seen in several areas. In the first place there was the power of the state which rested in the finances. Through the labors of Colbert, a reorganization of the finances of the state took place. Graft was reduced, strict accounting was imposed to cut the losses from the system. By encouraging commerce, industry and foreign expansion, the basic health of the country was promoted. In this way a surplus of funds was provided in place of the earlier debt. Then with the funds made available, Louis was able to produce an army under the direction of Louvois that remained at 100,000 men. Herein lay the new power of the French State. In the diplo-

LIBRARY OF THE

matic field Lionne produced an excellent staff of civil servants and diplomats. Thus internally and externally the crown was consolidated as supreme leader of the people.

The major part of Louis' career was filled with war as he sought to extend and enhance the powers of his state. These wars were: (1) a war with Spain for the possession of the Spanish Netherlands known as the War of Devolution (1667-1668); (2) a war with the Dutch (1672-1678); (3) the war of the Palatinate (1688-1697); (4) The war of the Spanish Succession (1702-1714). This last war was concluded by the Treaties of Utrecht and Rastatt, the country being left in a state of exhaustion and bankruptcy. "The material prosperity of his early years had vanished and its place . . . was a famished peasantry, an impoverished middle class, and a government breaking down under its burden of debt." 1) To his five-year-old grandson successor he left the government of a state in sore straits with the words, "Do not imitate me in my taste for war." 1)

When Louis XV (1715-1774) came of age and his noble prime minister Henry died (1743) he attempted to follow in the steps of Louis XIV. But he was unable to master his own house. The power of his position slipped into the hands of court favorites and mistresses who plundered the royal treasury under the guise of the kingly office. This in conjunction with the pressures of the nobility to continue in their priviledged position further weakened the finances

---

1) Schevill Ibid p. 302

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

of the country and the royal contact with the people. For in their position, the nobility were exempt from direct taxes, and managed to keep the rising middle classes from any effective say in reform, and governmental administration. The defeat of France in the Seven Years War (1756-1763) coupled with these other problems brought the kingdom to the point of domestic disintegration.

Though an attempt at reform was begun by Louis XVI (1774-1793) the privileged classes balked at the reform measures. By 1788 popular clamor demanded an Estates-General for reform and change, and the far-reaching French Revolution began.

In Germany, the situation during this period was quite different (from that of France). Germany was literally a crazy quilt of various states and principalities. Besides the states of political significance in Europe, Brandenburg-Prussia, and Austria-Hungary, there were the realms of nine electoral princes, nearly one-hundred other lay and secular princedoms, about a hundred duchies, fifty free towns, nearly as many minor church territories, and two or three thousand petty nobles and their estates.

This period witnessed, however, the rise of two major political units which were to be the primary movers in eventual German union.

The Great Elector, Frederick William (1640-1688) is the man to whom most credit should be given for the establishment of the strong state of Brandenburg-Prussia. By nurturing

LIBRARY OF THE

what he was given, by providing a strong, permanent, mercenary army, by wrestling control of all the small states from the hands of their diets, he was able to forge a mighty principality. His army gave him advantages in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, and later through a single army and civil service for all his territories he was able to command the respect of even the greatest states in Europe. When Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes in 1685 Frederick had made provision for accepting the refugee Huguenots who had fled France. He thereby strengthened his small kingdom with useful craftsmen and artisans.

His son and successor Frederick III (1688-1713) advanced the cause by becoming King of Prussia. Soon the state as a whole came to be known as Prussia.

But his son King Frederick William I (1713-1740) was the next ruler to make headway for the growth of the state. His work centred about perfecting the army, anddeveloping an efficient governmental administration. Through thrift he kept 80,000 men in the field guided and governed by iron discipline. The supervision and perfection of his civil service was no less strenuous. These factors plus the unifying gain of territory which brought his divided state together set the stage for the work of his son Frederick II (1740-1786).

The first twenty years of Frederick's reign were spent in maintaining his position against hostile Austrian, French, and Russian forces. By 1763 he held the field having gained

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

additional territories in the struggle. By way of developing his kingdom he promoted agriculture, drained swamps, improved the transportation and communication facilities, becoming through his work an eighteenth century "enlightened despot". Until his death in 1786 he continued to press for the development and prosperity of his country.

Austria-Hungary as the other state of great importance to later German union was, by the beginning of this period, the most important German state. Over it ruled the house of Habsburg that by now was practically the hereditary holders of the Imperial dignity. In this capacity there was the responsibility of defence of the Empire against the Turks in 1683. Through the following years the conquest of Turkish territories gave the Austrian nobles possession of the Kingdom of Hungary. The results of this struggle was the beginning of an absolutist state in the east modeled upon the French state. A single army was effectively created. No results were obtained in uniting the administrations. Upon the death of Charles VI who had no male heir, many states began to mobilize to carve up the territories left to his daughter Maria Theresa. It is to the skill of this woman and her Empire's power that the Austro-Hungarian Empire held together. Through the work of her son Joseph II (1765 Emperor) a determined effort once again began the work of uniting the various parts of the Empire under one administration. Various reform measures of a revolutionary nature decreed in 1780 were revoked by the end of his career (1790) because

of the vast differences that existed within his Empire. The Austrian Habsburg dominions were too diversified to ever come under one control or work for a unified Empire. All these peoples could not be cast into a single mould, and Austria went on as a state with mere external unity in an age of absolute rule.

This period begins in England with the kingdom rent by Civil War, with the victory of parliamentary forces, the execution of the king (Charles I) and a long struggle for the realization of the Puritan ideal. The Puritan rule during the Commonwealth, however, fell apart upon the death of Cromwell, and forced the recall of the heir to the throne, Charles II, in 1660.

The reaction which developed came largely from the Parliament. Many of the deeds of the Commonwealth were opposed and revoked; yet in terms of the King's powers, he still remained a limited monarch. Parliament's control of taxation was never again challenged (from this point onward). The Parliament did not revoke any of the powers of the king who could have pushed through royal decrees against parliamentary opposition. But in the aftermath of the revolution which had unseated Charles I, Charles II was not too interested in pushing for his causes. During this time the Parliament continued to exercise control over the church by passing a new Act of Uniformity (1662) for the re-established church. Several other acts against the non-conformists also came at this time. The rest of Charles' reign was, practically

speaking, a time of cooperation with the Parliament in the governing of the land.

His successor, James II (1685-1688) who was a Romanist, did not have the same relationship with Parliament as Charles. From the beginning, tactless and reactionary action on James' part alienated the legislative body. In 1688 by a bloodless coup, William of Orange, and his wife Mary, took control of England. Parliament declared the throne vacant by desertion and offered it to the Dutch rulers, thereby declaring that the English crown was not a divine-right appointment but given by the will of the people. Henceforth a king of England could boast no better claim to the crown than a statute of the realm. And in 1689, the last remaining link of divine-right absolute monarchy was broken by the Bill of Rights. This act provided that all kings were subject to the laws of the land, not superior to them. England herein entered the era of parliamentary government. From this point to the end of the era, English state development centres around the work and the life of the constitutional monarchy.

In the New World from 1648-1789 there developed a church-state relationship which was only slowly paralleled in England and which did not come until later in some of the other continental states.

The early colonies in North America took several forms. All were begun by the grant of a Royal Charter and were governed by a representative of the king and usually a local elected body. Some were formed for the purpose of settlement such as

Virginia and Maryland, where the settlers formed plantations all along the length of the rivers. In the north the St. Lawrence valley early received pioneers, but mainly here, for the purpose of trading. In either case, settlement came to be the norm of all the New World communities.

The history of the development briefly then begins with the Virginia colony whichwas established by the London Company in 1606 and reestablished in 1609. In 1624 the colony was returned to the crown as a Royal Colony under the King's direction. This royal control continued until the republic was set up in the War of Independence.

The Massachusetts Bay colony was the strongest of these new establishments. Whereas the Virginians were scattered by the circumstance of geography, the Massachusetts colony was a compact Puritan community. It was regulated by divine and natural law as defined by the Cambridge Platform of 1648. Only church members were granted political rights under the law, but non-church members were still required to pay taxes and attend services of the church. Throughout its history dissenting groups were dismissed from the territories of the colony to found Rhode Island, and the Connecticut colony.

The "Middle Colonies", Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, developed and grew up in a different atmosphere than that of the earlier colonies. Being post-civil war (England) they reflected a growing toleration of another man's point of view, and a democratic spirit that goes along with toleration. Factors making this democratic, or free conscience government

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

possible, were the result of economic interests, isolation, and a new spirit of frontier independence.

During the eighteenth century, there was steady growth within the thirteen colonies of the Atlantic seaboard. In the first four decades of the century the colonies developed independently under a policy which has been described as one of "salutary neglect". They were left alone to pursue development in their own fashion. At the same time however, they were willing to endure much economic hardship so that the mother country would aid them against French and Indian foes in the north. "The thirteen colonies were distinct entities, disparate in origin, in social structure, in religious composition, andin economic activity". 2)

By 1763, and the conclusion of the Seven Years War, the colonies began to react against Britain. The economic impositions of the war, the desire for some representation before taxation, and other common interests brought the colonies together. Meetings which began as colonial congress developed into full fledged Continental Congresses by 1774. The attempt was made to settle differences with Great Britain. They failed. Two years later at the Continental Congress of July 4, 1776, a "declaration of independence" was adopted by the assembled delegates. Written largely by Thomas Jefferson, the articles were opposed to the trends of absolutist governments.

> 1. All men - not merely Englishmen - are endowed by their Creator, the Declaration boldly asserted, with certain "unalienable rights", among which are "life,

---

2) Hayes Modern Europe to 1870 p. 467

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

> liberty, and the pursuit of happiness". 2. All governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed" - a succinct statement of the principle of popular, as opposed to aristocratic government. 3. Hence it is perfectly justifiable to overthrow a tyrannical government and establish a popular one, by force of arms if necessary; in other words, there is a "right of revolution".3)

The results are well known. In a war that lasted for six years, the colonies eventually came out the victor. Britain made peace and the United States was formed on the basis of a Constitution drafted in 1787. In 1789 the federal constitution went into effect with George Washington as the first president.

* * * *

---

3) Ibid p. 472.

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

The earliest writer in this period who was to exert a wide influence upon the nature of the state was Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679). From the inception of his political writings Hobbes was a defender of the absolute monarchy. The Civil War period sent him in flight to the continent because of his absolutist leanings, and there he largely constructed his theory of royal sovereignty. In Leviathan (1651) Hobbes maintained that absolute monarchy is the most justified position because it is the most rational means of dealing with human nature. Man is an unsocial animal, selfish and hostile to all other men. But to overcome his traits he has entered into a "social contract" with his prince, whereby the absolutist political state is organized supreme in all matters, religious and secular. Once established the contract can never be broken or revoked, for to do that would cause anarchy and civil war.

In Leviathan Hobbes sums up his argument in this way.

> The only way to erect such a common power, as may be able to defend them from the invasions of foreigners, and the injuries of one another . . . is to confer all their power and strength on one man, or upon one assembly of men, that may reduce all their wills, by plurality of voices, unto one man . . . And in him consisteth the essence of Commonwealth; which, to define it, is: one person, of whose acts a great multitude, by mutual covenants one with another, have made themselves every one the author, to the end that he may use the strength and means of them all as he shall think expedient for their peace and common defence." 4)

His reaction to the Civil War and the Commonwealth Government under Cromwell may be seen in chapter XVIII of

---

4) Levithan - Hobbes, Thomas. Ch. XVII From Great Books of the Western World.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

Leviathan. Here the rights of the sovereign, the ruler of the state, are fully discussed. Because the subjects are in covenant with the monarch they must obey him. They cannot cast his leadership aside. Not even in the event that a claim is made for a covenant with God can the covenant with the king be rejected. This action would be presumptuous and unmanly.

There are many more examples of his thought on the person and work of the monarch. The criticism raised against Hobbes by his writings may be used as the basis of an evaluation of his scheme. His work has been dubbed ungodly by those who see the need of a God-centred view of the state. Hobbes himself did not consider God as the starting point at all for his analysis of the state, but reason and the desire to avoid anarchy and civil strife. His work begins the era which no longer takes serious account of a state under God's control and action. The state has been set up by man as another institution and therefore, as such, it must control everything including religion. The basic theological implication in his system would presumably be based only upon his view of the all powerful sovereign. He says: "This is the Generation of that great Leviathan, or rather, to speak more reverently, of that mortal god to which we owe, under the immortal God, our peace and defence". 5) God is recognized, but the king is exalted to a godly position, subject to none but God. And the relation to God is not

---

5) Hobbes Ibid ch. XVII

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

defined.

Another Englishman at this time, John Lilburne, indicated that men are free and equal by nature. Their government is created by a social contract in order to preserve their rights of freedom and equality. Whenever the basic freedoms are under attack the government may be recomposed at will to meet the threat.

It was John Locke (1632-1704), however, that came to the forefront to defend the contract theory and the sovereignty of the people. Following the overthrow of the absolutist king James II in 1688, a new theory to justify the country's action was needed. In answering the need, Locke argued that man has natural rights to life, liberty and property. The government is a creation then, of men for the protection of these rights. Should the government fail to live up to its responsibility, the people have the right to revolt and replace it with one that will. This in effect makes the people sovereign. Furthermore, since the people are sovereign, decisions must be based upon a majority decision. If the government is to protect the rights of the citizens, it must grant religious freedom. The freedom of course was restricted in the case of Romanists, since their faith indicated allegiance to a foreign sovereign.

His statements concerning the powers and privileges of the government serve to illustrate the general outline of thought.

> Political power, then, I take to be a right of making laws, with penalties of death, and consequently all less

> penalties for the regulating and preserving of property, and of employing the force of the community in the executive of such laws, and in the defence of the commonwealth from foreign injury, and all this only for the public good. 6) This legislative is not only the supreme power of the commonwealth, but sacred and unalterable in the hands where the community once placed it... Nor can any edict of any one else ... have the force and obligation of a law which has not its sanction from that legislative which the public has chosen and appointed. 7)

There are more extended passages, but generally Locke saw the superiority of the legislative body. As in the case of Hobbes there was the basis in reason, but not in God. The people formed the "social contract" because it was in their best interest. That God was sovereign over all took only a secondary place. Reason again supplants the authority of God as the basis upon which the ordered state and society must be built.

Montesquieu, in his Spirit of the Laws 1748 opened a new approach to the position of the state in society. He discarded both "the state of nature", and the "social contract" hypothesis as nonsense. Rather he used a detailed analysis of history to show that no government was perfect, but that the competing and conflicting spheres of influence must be adapted to the needs of the people. He favored the English system of government and built up an ideal theory of balance and counterbalance of power as he thought he saw it in the Island government. Ideally he felt that the French governmental power should have been divided among the king,

---

6) Concerning Civil Government, Locke, Section 3
7) Locke Ibid Section 134.

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

'parlements', and provincial estates. In all this there was a place for the church only in so far as it exercised a balance against too much power being asserted by the crown. He held no respect for the church's teaching on the state and essentially denied the existence of a supreme, powerful God who would rule over the lands.

Voltaire (1694-1778) another Frenchman who ridiculed the state of his day, still saw the power of the nation-state in terms of an absolute dictatorship. He did however, demand that such a ruler be enlightened. The enlightened despotism was necessary in the state to make it powerful "to overcome ignorance, habit, credulity, and priestcraft. . ." 8) For this type of government Voltaire turned to the emerging state of Prussia as his model.

It was Jean-Jacques Rousseau to whom the French owe many of the ideas which helped the cause of the French Revolution along. His work followed essentially on John Locke's thesis of the social contract. In a tract published in 1761, Social Contract, he emphasized that all governments exercise power by virtue of an agreement made by people in a state of nature. This agreement, since it was arrived at by the people, was subject to their will, and could be changed by them. In this respect Rousseau took over Locke's position of the right of revolution and the sovereignty of the people. Where Locke saw the lowly savage in the state of nature, Rousseau saw the "Romantic" picture of the noble and virtuous savage that modern

---

8) Palmer Ibid p. 296.

society had degraded through civilization. Man's purpose in government is to regain this freedom which he had in his original condition. "Man is born free and everywhere he is in chains." 9) To have freedom then, he must throw off the chains and establish a democracy of equals. Directed toward the masses as it was, the Social Contract became the basis of the freedom desired and gained by the masses of the French people ever since. Its ultimate result was the rule of the people expressed in and through the Revolution and the democratic government existing in France now. Each man is considered part of the state, not for the state's purposes, but that the state might exist for the people.

Some comments arising on the nature of the state in relation to God came from Jablonski, the court preacher in Berlin. During the reign of Frederick the Great (1740-1786) he stated that: "God is a heavenly king, and the king an earthly mortal God . . . Yet both are Gods and both kings, and both to be feared and honored." 10) The feeling in the German states at this time ran in this direction of absolutism. All things were subservient to the state and its master. The church was completely in the hands of the civil rulers also, as the princes ruled them, making sure that no bishops, synods or other organs of self-government ever controlled the church. "By the end of the eighteenth century the churches had became tools of secular policy in the absolute states of Germany . . . and 'A minister was only entitled to exist . . .

---

9) Social Contract opening line ch. 1.
10) Nichols A History of Christianity 1650-1950 p. 46.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

under state control and by authority of the prince, as a moral teacher, a farmer, a listmaker, a secret agent of police'." 11) Under such rigid control, the church became literally another office of the state bureaucracy , and the ministry was the chief instrument of government. For the state under God, this is very dangerous, because the people who should be leading men nearer to God become instruments for keeping them away. And with no voice of judgement to speak against the state the chances of improvement from within become very limited.

---

11) Ibid p. 52.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

CHAPTER IV

REVOLUTION AND DEMOCRACY

1789-1914

The history of this fourth major period in the development of the nation-state is vast and complicated. More than ever before, ample records exist for determining causes and effects, and the interacting roles of the many participating factors. If the survey of the development appears scanty and very general, only so could the limits of the subject be kept within bounds.

On the continent, the French nation became the focus of attention for the next quarter century. The decline of the power of the "ancien regime", strangling feudal customs, privileged classes and exploited peoples were all factors in causing the French Revolution. Early beginnings made by turning the Estates General into the National Assembly provided a basis of government apart from the monarchy. In 1792 a Legislative Assembly was established which lasted for a year. The National Convention was in power from 1793-1796. During these seven momentous years, the monarchy and all the existing feudal trappings were swept away. A form of representative government was established and the First Republic was conceived in 1792. After 1795 the Republic was in more and more serious difficulties, until in 1799 a young general of the army, Napoleon Bonaparte took over the government as First Consul.

During the next five years until 1804, the nation prospered, became stable, and was renewed through law, culture, and religion under Napoleon's powerful leadership.

These years also marked the ascendancy of France over

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

corrupt and dismembered Europe. Having captured northern Italy for France in 1796 Napoleon, after 1799, went on to capture and reorganize Germany, Italy, Switzerland and the Western Mediterranean Islands. The practical result in Germany was: the lessening of the number of states from over three hundred to thirty-eight; the implanting of a simple set of civil laws, the Code Napoleon; the upsurge of a German nationalism. Similarly in Italy and wherever the French carried their conquests, the influence of Napoleon sparked renewal.

This renewed and upsurging nationalism soon worked against France. The Spaniards objected to the Emperor's light treatment of their nation and rebelled when Joseph, older brother of Napoleon, was placed upon the Spanish throne. Germany also began to prepare for a showdown in its various states. Russia and Britain opposed further French enhancement of power. The result was disaster for the Empire and Napoleon. France was defeated, Napoleon exiled, and the first French Empire passed away.

Following the Congress of Vienna (1815) a strong conservative reaction set in. The Bourbon dynasty was restored to power under Louis XVIII. Ultra-royalists who had returned with Louis slowly took over government control in an effort to turn time back to pre-1789. After the death of Louis XVIII and the accession of Charles X the forces of reaction grew more demanding until Charles attempted a "coup d'etat" in 1830.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Students and workmen in Paris rioted forcing Charles to abdicate, and in the shuffle that followed, moderate monarchists called for a constitutional monarchy headed by Louis Philippe, Duke of Orleans. Herein the conservative reaction faltered, making it very apparent that the nation desired the guarantee of a government that would preserve their freedoms.

But the new monarchy was not altogether popular either, so that by 1848, discontent and republican feelings had grown enough to tumble once again the objectionable monarchy. This time, the nephew of Napoleon, Louis Napoleon came to the presidency of the second Republic. In the National Assembly, the legislators set to work to draft a new constitution for the republic. Insisting on the democratic principle that "all public powers emanate from the people , it drew up a document which vested the legislative power in a single assembly of 750 members elected by universal male suffrage. The executive power was conferred on a president elected for four years." 1) But the election of Prince Louis Napoleon, a man who had never given up his claims to the French Imperial title foreshadowed the fall of the Second Republic. True to form, by 1851 Louis transformed the Second Republic into the Second Empire, doing away with all the democratic - republican gains of the revolution of 1848.

The unification of Germany and the sound defeat of France in 1870 caused the French to cast off Napoleon III

---

1) Schevill Ibid p. 474.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

as they had done with all the previous monarchies, at the same time preparing for a third republic. By 1875 a constitution was set up for the republic which lasted until the end of World War I. "The executive was vested in a president elected for a term of seven years by the two houses of the legislature meeting in common session." 2) The executive power was wielded through the Chamber of Deputies, where the president had to have a majority of votes to execute his legislation.

The Germany that Napoleon encountered in the early nineteenth century was a highly disorganized group of states. After he left, there were thirty-eight minor and major bodies where there had been over three hundred. The task confronting Germany was one of unification, now more important than ever before, because of the newly emerging national spirit. The contenders for the right to lead this nationalist sentiment towards effective union were Prussia and Austria, long rivals in the defunct Holy Roman Empire.

Prussia proved to be the victor in this contest, largely owing to the work of several of her leaders. The cessation of hostilities with Napoleon left Prussia a strong centralized state. In the years following, however, cries arose for increasing reform toward constitutional government in Prussia. Steps were taken to pacify insurgents during the crises of 1830 and 1848, but generally the monarch kept a tight reign on the government. In 1858, a new monarch, William I became

---

2) Ibid p. 562.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

King of Prussia and began at once to plan for German unity. His able chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, forged a realistic and vigorous program which dragged the states through three wars to a united German Empire, proclaimed in 1870.

The German Empire with William I as Emperor, was politically based upon the North German Confederation which had been molded by Bismarck in 1867.

> The twenty-two states which made up the North German Confederation accepted the King of Prussia as chief executive under the title of president, while the legislative power was entrusted to a Federal Council or "Bundesrat", representing the participating governments, and a parliament, or "Reichstag", representing the people and elected by universal male suffrage.
>
> Although the twenty-two member states preserved a broad measure of autonomy, they lost their leading sovereign rights, which were taken over by the new federal institutions, the Bundesrat, the Reichstag, and, above all, the King of Prussia in his capacity of president. While the constitution, drafted by Bismarck, made in the elected Reichstag a considerable concession to liberal opinion, the document was so framed that the head of the new state, that is, the King of Prussia, exercised effective control. 3)

The same basis existed in the German Empire until its dissolution in 1918. It may be concluded that despite the liberal elements of the constitution, the Emperor was not limited, and his nation, at last a state, was not an entity of popular political sovereignty like that in the making in France.

In Great Britain, the National development of the state may be described very generally as the growth of liberal democracy. At the conclusion of the peace with France in

---

3) Ibid p. 544.

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

1815, Britain had a Conservative government bent upon maintaining what they had. But this government was based upon a minority of the people of landed wealth. Laws dating from the Glorious Revolution in 1688 maintained definite political disadvantages for Dissenters and Roman Catholic elements alike. The Industrial Revolution had caused a shift in the centres of the population to new industrial areas, but representatives came from "pocket" and "rotten boroughs" to the seats of the Commons. Reform groups set out to correct these abuses and to establish a sounder foundation for the government of the Nation. Therefore in 1828 the Test Acts against "Dissenters" was abolished. In 1829 the Catholic Emancipation law was passed in the Commons giving Roman Catholics equal privileges with the Protestants. By the Reform Bill of 1832 the worst abuses of the "rotten" boroughs were destroyed and a more uniform franchise was established. Under its provisions 143 seats were taken from the "rotten" boroughs and given to the new industrial areas and the franchise was extended to landholders whose property was valued at £10 a year. In the boroughs, the vote was given to occupants of houses worth £10 a year or more. The Second Reform Bill -1867 extended the reform by transferring 58 seats more and adding twelve to the House of Commons. For the voter, the privilege of voting was extended to all house-holders with £5 a year house value, and to all lodgers in

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

tenements whose lodgings were valued at £10. Further gains were made in 1885 toward the enfranchisement of the masses, but it wasn't until the conclusion of World War I that universal suffrage was granted to the British electorate.

In other fields of government activity, legislation was introduced for the organization and protection of the labor force. Free trade was encouraged, thus granting the citizens of Britain ample freedom to pursue economic gains for the nation. And with the development of her overseas colonies through settlement by emigrees from the homeland, Britain came to see the advantages of affording opportunity for the development of indigenous governments. In 1867 the Dominion of Canada was constituted through the British North America Act as four eastern provinces joined together. Provision was made also for the addition of other territories into the Dominion, Newfoundland being the last of these territories to join.

The pattern thus established provided a basis for the self-determination granted to Australia in 19ol, New Zealand in 1907, and the Union of South Africa in 1909. Begun as an experiment in selfgovernment, the example set by Great Britain toward Canada provided a solid foundation for good will around the world to this day. The development of the democratic institutions which flourish most strongly in Britain no doubt is one of the main factors of this popularity. The spirit of freedom is also a factor which has helped to preserve the two

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

party government based upon the solid support of the people, the sovereign power of the land.

Italy, as it has already been noted, was a group of separate states well down into the nineteenth century, just as Germany was. By the middle of the century a nationalist feeling began to develop that eventually united the whole peninsula under the King Victor Emmanual II. The king's chief minister in the process of union, was Cavour, a Piedmontese of long ancestry. It was Cavour's firm conviction that Italy could by united only through the efforts of the Sardinia-Piedmont kingdom, the only truly Italian state that existed. During the Crimean War, Cavour curried favor with Great Britain and especially France in the hope of gaining support against Austria which occupied part of Northern Italy. In 1858, he and Napoleon III worked out an agreement to fight against Austria in which France was to get Nice and Savoy, while Victor Emmanuel II would gain Lombardy and Venetia. Lombardy only, was gained, but the advance opened up wild national feelings throughout the peninsula. In 1860 the northern petty princedoms drove out their rulers and called for annexation to Sardinia-Piedmont. Later that year the kingdom of the Two Sicilies was drawn into the union through the efforts of Garibaldi, and Cavour, who disputed Garibaldi's possession of the kingdom. In November of 1860 the Papal States, excluding Rome, were annexed also, and in 1861, the kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont became the kingdom of Italy.

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

In 1866 Venetia was gained after Austria was defeated by Prussia, and in 1870, when the French troops were pulled out of Rome, the city was annexed and declared the capital of the united kingdom.

Following the union of the country, a constitutional parliamentary government was established. There was an upper house appointed by the king. The Chamber of Deputies, the lower house, ruled the country through the cabinet or ministry. To make the government a centralized administration, prefects were appointed who were responsible to the central authority. The government of the nation came to be patterned after the French example more than the British, but combined features of both. Unfortunately for the state, the divisions which existed prior to union, i.e. Lombardy, Piedmont, and the southern states, continued after the union. The deputies when they came to Rome fought for their own interests, often to the exclusion of the interests of the state as a whole.

The new government had other problems to face beside the question of union. The major one was the latent war which the popes waged after the annexation of the Papal States and Rome. The papal office was greatly incensed by the loss of its territories, and directed anti-Italian propaganda across the world. To counteract this, the Law of Papal Guarantees was passed by the government in 1871. "Thereby the kingdom pledged itself to look upon the pope as a sovereign on a par with the Italian monarch; . . . to suffer

LIBRARY OF THE
OF ALBERTA

him to send and receive ambassadors without the exercise of any supervision." 5) The pope was made, in effect, a sovereign with the same status as a king, and was granted the Vatican and Lateran extraterritorially. It was not until 1929, however, that the pope came to terms with the Italian government, when a Concordat was signed with Mussolini.

The United States during the nineteenth century underwent many changes which profoundly altered her world status from a small colonial entity to a world power. Involved were three major factors: emerging nationalism from 1800-1830, rapid western expansion, and sectionalism in north and south which eventually brought civil war. The nationalist feelings which grew in the first three decades of the century were replaced slowly by the differences over the slave, industrial, and economic issues. Slavery especially presented a problem in relation to territorial expansion, for the north felt this injustice should not be carried into the new states being organized, and the southerners felt economically compelled to do so. The result was a split into Union North, and Confederate South, and the waging of a four year war (1861-1865) for the maintenance of the United States. When the war ended in favor of the Union, the reaffirmation of the responsibility of the state to provide justice for all was fulfilled. The years remaining in this era were given over to the reconstruction of an American nationalism and the strengthing of the nation by the addition of other territories as states of the Union.

---

5) Schevill, Ibid p. 558.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

The place of Russia in the treatment of the nation-state has been avoided because of its odd position among the western nations. Until the sixteenth century, the country was a collection of backward tribes. But in that century, however, contacts began with the western European civilization which eventually gave Russia a foothold in Europe. Under Tsar Alexis in 1667 the state moved towards the Ukraine, and his son Peter I (1682-1725) continued toward westernization. Through untiring efforts Peter travelled, studied, and incorporated what he could to expand Russian knowledge. A military drive gave Russia the port of Azov on the Black Sea at the expense of Turkey. To spur the growth a new military machine based on the western model was created. Reforms were introduced, and western Europeans were invited to settle in the land to give leadership in many fields. By 1703 a foothold on the Baltic was secured, and St. Petersburg was established.

Politically, Russia was an odd autocracy. The Tsar was a strange mixture of Byzantine Autocrat and Mongolian Khan, yet with checks upon his power. The Patriarch of Moscow, a ruler over the richly endowed Russian Church, and the Streltsi, a sort of national militia, maintained checks upon the Tsars prior to Peter I. But by Peter, the church came under state control with the Tsar as ruler, and the Streltsi was disbanded. Hence two hindrances of the past were gone, and the Russian state marched westward.

The Tsarina Catherine II (1762-1796) was the next

important figure to guide the Russian state. Her reign was featured by the swallowing up of much of Poland and an advance into the Balkan territories. By the end of her reign Russia was ranked as a strong European power and a nation striving after Western civilization.

The concern of Russia during the nineteenth century was the further expansion into the west, especially toward Constantinople. Only through the interference of Britain and France was this prevented.

In Russian state life the nineteenth century produced liberal reactions much like those experienced in the other European states. Reform was sought in the area of serf-emancipation, government assemblies, and land reforms. In the Emancipation Manifesto (1861). Alexander II provided freedom from landowners, but substituted a more odious serfdom under the state. Some local assemblies of selfgovernment were also allowed, and civil and criminal courts came into being. A Polish national rebellion, however, in 1863, caused Alexander to revert to reaction and the many gains were discarded. From this point onward to 1914, the Russian state went through a period of slow decay. The Tsarist regime could not, and did not, meet the needs of the people who sought new opportunities in life. A decadent upper class society proved no more lively than which had been in control of France a century before, heading for the same fate.

Some mention must be made of the minor states of Europe which have been considered before. As France developed into

a republican form of government during the nineteenth century, so did Switzerland. The thirteen Cantons in the Swiss federation developed into a strong national state along primarily the same republican lines indicated for the Third Republic. The Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, on the other hand produced constitutional monarchies very similar to the British system. In all these instances there are differences of course, but generally speaking, France and Great Britain provide the pattern for western democratic development.

* * * *

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

The theory of the state during this period may be found both in secular and theological sources. The early advances in state theory came as a result of the restoration of the "ancien regime" in France, as though the Revolution had never occured. Several men of the period, Lamennais, De Maistre and De Bonald called to the past as prophets of tradition. The emphasis in France, came to be "restoration", and "legitimacy" with the church as a watchdog of the reactionary principles. The state itself assumed many of the offices formerly held by the church, especially in education even though the schools were staffed by the clergy. By 1830 Lamennais, Lacordaire and Montalembert, editors of a Paris newspaper L'Avenir, were airing new views on what the state should be. Lamennais, especially, proposed a union of the papal forces with those of the revolution to produce a liberal Catholicism. The end result would be the formation of a Catholic party within the state, a party that could be used to the church's advantage in developing a renewed Christian state. This "liberal Catholicism" was papalist or ultramontane in purpose only, and liberal in its tactics.

In mirari vos (1832) "liberal Catholicism" was repudiated by Pope Gregory XVI. Civil, political, and religious liberty was condemned, and reaction in the papal court continued as the basis of Roman practice because of the desire not to alienate any of the monarchies by liberal thoughts. An absolute monarchy in the Papal States until 1870 also provided a great inducement for the maintenance of

the reactionary processes.

In France, however, the friends of Lamennais began to organize a Roman Catholic political party. Such was the strength of the party, and its active leadership, that even the conservative bishops began to make use of its influence. In the 1848 election the party gained nearly one-third of the French assembly. In Belgium, the freedom granted by the Revolution of 1830 was used to set up a liberal state governed by liberals and the Roman Catholic bloc. Prussia granted the Roman church freedom in 1850 through liberal pressures. Even though it was against papal principles, the advances of liberalism went on throughout the century.

In 1863 two very interesting meetings took place which eventually resulted in the promulgation by Pope Pius IX of the Syllabus of Errors. In Munich Roman Catholic scholars demanded freedom: from scholasticism and for academic freedom. In Malines, Montalembert defended political liberalism as a program for Roman Catholics. He demanded that Roman Catholics support universal suffrage, civil equality, liberty of the press, education, association, and even of conscience. As indicated, this was the very time of Italy's reunion movement, and so the reaction in Rome was to associate this desire of liberty with the archenemy of the Papal States, the Kingdom of Italy. So in the index of the Syllabus of Errors, Pius attempted to gather all he thought he had learned about the church and state. It was to be an outline of the errors in the world in view of the true Roman Catholic

OF ALBERTA

position. "He worked to identify Roman Catholicism inseparably with the old political system of the Restoration, the old regime of social hierarchy, monarchical absolutism, and ecclesiastical monopoly and intolerance . . ." 6)

The major error of modern society, he insisted, was that rejection of the rights of the hierarchy to guide and regulate public affairs. "Governments and states should properly be subordinated to clerical theocratic control . . . In contrast to caesaropapism, . . . the Roman Catholic position is clerical supremacy in and over the state. Separation of church and state . . . was specifically condemned". 6) The Syllabus condemned also the state's presumptions in matters of education, property, and the civil laws relating to the church and clergy.

The nations that had developed constitutional rights and liberties were loath to accept this promulgation by the pope. A great need was felt by many Romanists also for modification of its terms. Many interpretations were issued on the meaning of the Syllabus, but one by the French Bishop Dupanloup became the most famous of all. He distinguished between absolute truth (the "thesis") and contingent necessities (the "hypothesis"). If the church did not compromise the former, it could be accommodating to the latter. The interpretation opened the door for many Roman Catholics to support their constitutional governments while not being alienated from the church. The Syllabus, as reinterpreted,

---

6) Nichols Ibid p. 212.

is still a claim on the part of the papal office to superiority in all phases of life. Indeed, Padre Curci in 1883 wrote an article Il Vaticano regio, which compares the Syllabus with Dictatus Papae of the days of Gregory VII. The Roman church had modified its position very little in the last eight-hundred years.

The result of the papal enactments for the rest of this period was the famed "Kulturkampf" in Germany, and anti-clericalism in France. Nichols terms these reactions to the Roman church the international "Kulturkampf" and indicates that it was largely the result of the church's inability to meet the new democracies. In Germany where the struggle first developed, a compromise was reached in 1880, and by the end of that decade peace was restored in Germany. Here, as in Italy and in France, the issues centred on supremacy - church or state - in matters of government. It was not resolved in any of the states until the secular government was recognized by the hierarchy as legally responsible according to Dupanloup's "hypothesis" of control. Only reluctantly did the papal office submit to the extremity of the various situations, for had they held out for the "thesis" of the Syllabus, the whole church might have collapsed.

Leo XIII's response to the situation, and his political views sum up clearly the Roman Catholic position during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. His major premise was clerical supremacy, agreeing with the Syllabus. But democracy and political liberalism were opposed to clericalism

because they presumed the separation of church and state. "Catholic democracy" as Leo saw it was something within very specific limits. There could be no freedom of religion, of conscience, of speech, of the press or of assembly, because this would oppose, in principle, the basis of Roman control, the Index and Inquisition, to censorship and propaganda. "Roman Catholicism, ideally and in principle, condemns civil and religious liberty." 7) "Roman Catholic democracy" means simply, government of the people, for the people, by authoritarians. This was made quite clear in Rerum novarum and Au Milieu des Sollicitudes where democracy in the Roman sense is merely benevolent despotism. In these encyclicals it was also affirmed that the best type of government was that of a legitimate prince. Here then, we may see completely reactionary tendencies, striking against the more progressive forms of modern government.

The nineteenth century produced a new view of the growth and perfection of the state known now as Communism. The exponent of the theory developed on the basis of historical study was Karl Marx, a Prussian-German. Marx was one of many utopian writers of the century who were wrestling with the deplorable conditions in which the industrial workers had to earn their living. Through his study he felt that there were two major principles underlying the development of a government. They were economic determinism and class conflict.

---

7) Ibid p. 235.

The economic situation of any nation determines its art, religion, morals and government control. Since everything is always in a state of flux, there must be conflict in relation to the economic situation, this conflict being the class struggle. The last and the lowest class was that of the worker, and once the worker overturned the rule of the upper classes, the socialist society would emerge. Presumably in the emergence of the socialist society, all inequalities would be removed making each man the same as everyone else. Finally, the historical pattern would be fulfilled when everyone was equal, and the state, the agency of the proletarian victory, would "wither away" for want of anything to do. According to Marxian theory, this would happen as working men everywhere united into an army shoulder to shoulder. But where Marx advocated pacifism for the achievement of the ends of socialism or communism, some of his followers such as a Frenchman Proudhon, and a Russian Michael Bakunin, advocated violent anarchy. Though thrown out of the First Communist International by Marx, Bakunin maintained his anarchist principles, making them the foundation of the revolutionary activity that later claimed Russia for the communist cause.

The state under God in North America early took a form different from that in Europe. The constant principle of the federal government of the United States was a strict separation of the church and state. By the Declaration of Independence, as we have already noted, the state granted

religious preference to no group; by the first ammendment to the constitution, religious toleration and freedom were granted to all.

Though these freedoms were granted, they could not be taken for granted. The Federalist Congress up to 1801 had passed measures limiting the freedom of the press and freedom of speech. The elections of 1801, however, turned out John Adams, and the Federalist Congress, and returned Thomas Jefferson, one of the drafters of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson asserted during the drafting of the Declaration that all men were created equal, and he believed it at his inauguration, when he delivered this address in answer to the Federalist measures of the preceding Congress.

> . . . During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussions and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the nation, announced according to the rules of the constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will to be rightful must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal law must protect, and to violate would be oppression . . . Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. . . 8)

In the course of the century which the nation had entered, Jefferson's words were to be sorely tested, as any statement on man's freedom and liberties are. For Jefferson's

---

8) Brentano F. Nation under God p. 107.

declaration was an echo of the Declaration of Independence, and the American people were to spend the best part of the nineteenth century working out its implications.

Thus by the 1840's there was a widespread feeling that the state should be responsible for more than declaring on the rights of man, of freedom of worship, the press, speech, but should be responsible for guaranteeing the rights. A strong current developed in the Northern States, that opposed the slavery in the south, and the effects this had upon the "rights of man" article of the Constitution. As the years pressed on past the middle of the century, the tension over the slavery issue grew until it was the matter of a split nation, or war to maintain a union dedicated to the highest principles. The figure in the north who became the spokesman for the highest ideal was Abraham Lincoln. In a short ten- sentence address he spoke for the whole Union cause, of a nation under God, seeking to work out its highest calling. In the Gettysburg Address, at the dedication of the Cemetery there for a war memorial, Lincoln set forth his position with great conviction.

> Fourscore and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.
>
> Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation - or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated - can long endure.
>
> We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We are met to dedicate a portion of it as the final resting place of those who have given their lives that that nation might live.

> It is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.
>
> But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow, this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or to detract.
>
> The world will little note nor long remember what we say here; but it can never forget what they did here.
>
> It is for us, the living, rather, to be dedicated, here, to the unfinished work that they have thus far so nobly carried on. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us; that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that the nation shall, under God, have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth. 9)

Lincoln's hope for his nation was fulfilled, for the champions of justice won the victory and began again the task of rebuilding the nation. But it was not only the great figures of this period who count in victory of a nation dedicated to these high principles, but the common people of the land had their places also.

There was Thomas Kennedy, a Scotch Presbyterian who labored so hard forremoval of the political disabilities of minority groups. In 1826 his "Jew Bill" passed the state legislature in Maryland by a one vote majority. And there was Harriet Beecher Stowe, author of Uncle Tom's Cabin, who composed the novel against slavery in answer to the challenge

---

9) Ibid pp. 84-85.

of a friend. "Despite the novel's melodrama and sentimentality, its impact was so tremendous that President Lincoln later greeted Mrs. Stowe as "the little woman who wrote the book that caused this great war." 10) The impact of the novel was to crystallize the opinion of the Northerners against the injustices of the slave issue. After the war, the victory in defeat of great men, like Robert E.Lee, set a challenge for the nation. Where he had commanded men during the war, for fighting and death, in the peace that followed, he retired to a small college to prepare men for a constructive future. Rejecting bitterness, he led the way with the statement, "Abandon your animosities, and make your sons Americans." 11) Thus south and north began a national building once again. The final task of making a nation for free men, sharing equal opportunity was not accomplished, however. It has been left for the citizens of this century to struggle for the achievement of this great underlying principle of the Constitution.

Our last concern in this chapter is the general Protestant view of the state which was predominant in the nineteenth century. As the challenge of the century developed around the responsibility of the church toward the social problems inherent in industrialization, so the response to the problems grew toward a Christian socialism and its

---

10) Ibid p. 109.
11) Ibid p. 113.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

approach to the state. The social gospel which developed came to be associated with one branch of the Protestant body, the "ascetic Protestants", as Troeltsch called them. These were the Calvinists, the Baptists, and the Pietistic sects, as opposed to Lutheranism or Roman Catholicism. Troeltsch, thus distinguishes between Lutheranism and Ascetic Protestantism because of their different emphases.

In the last chapter we saw that the state church in the Lutheran lands came to be mere instruments for governmental use. In the present period, the situation was aggravated because of the great Lutheran emphasis upon justification by faith. The movement toward social reform, legislative action, and the establishment of a new order by changing the world was not undertaken. The state was part of the natural order, guided by God. In this respect it gained a supernatural significance and had to be respected and endured. "Lutheranism casts aside its asceticism . . . and gives itself up to repose in the blessedness of the Divine Mercy . . . and whenever it becomes dubious about the world and about sin it withdraws into the refuge of its inner happiness of justification through faith..." 12)

Ascetic Protestantism, on the other hand, looked at the state according to its rational principle in responsibility to God, and the people from whom it received its mandate. It exists on the basis of human expediency only. The various

---

12) Troeltsch, E. The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches. p.808.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

functions and offices of the state have been appointed by God and the people, but are not endowed with a divine-right. There is to be no chance of honors being paid to the creature that would interfere with the homage man owes to God. In this manner, there can be a strong sense of equality for all men in the eyes of the creator . But an exception must be seen in the European democracies where there exists the sense of God's providence in establishing different orders in society.

Troeltsch sums up Ascetic Protestantism's view toward the state thus:

> It is inclined towards a liberal or democratic conception of the State, apart from equalitarian theories; it tends to regard the state simply as something which must be endured; it glorifies its own national inheritance more for its religious mission than for its political greatness; and it likes to regulate international relationships according to peace principles, which are also reasonable, and from the business point of view desirable. 13)

In terms of the social gospel, and reform measures, the state would obviously come under strict surveillance and remodeling on the basis of this view. And this reform did begin during the last years of the period as the democracies remodeled labor laws, working conditions and the suffrage of the electors.

---

13) Ibid p. 812.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

CHAPTER V

THE AGE OF WORLD WARS

1914-1961

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

This last chapter will be concerned with the period between 1914 and 1961, an age of world rocking violence, of new states, and of greater empires. It is the time of the absolute consolidation of states great and small; of the emergence of new nation-states, and of the destruction of many others that had nourished hopes for a national destiny.

The first World War was preceded by the development of two major continental power-blocs in Europe. Through colonial interest, these blocs came into conflict over the whole world, until the insane jealousies exploded into war. By 1917 it became a world conflict with the entry of the last major nation, the United States. It is the settlement at Versailles, and not the war, that is of primary interest for this study, however. Of the five major powers that entered the war, only four were in at the end, Russia having made peace to pursue her own revolution. Each of the parties, Britain led by Lloyd George, France by Clemenceau, Italy by Orlando, and the United States by Wilson, represented interests that decided the Continent's future for twenty years. France, Britain and Italy, generally speaking, were colonial powers seeking a peace that would be beneficial in terms of overseas possessions. Wilson represented the United States in pursuing a settlement on the basis of a "fourteen point program." Among these were the establishment of a League of Nations for world government, an International Court of Justice, and a peace that granted the various European national groups their own government.

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY
OF ALBERTA

In the peace that did follow many of Wilson's pet proposals met severe tests where they were in conflict with the other members of the Big Four. But out of his plan there came a new attempt at international mediation and cooperation which continued to operate without conspicuous success. But let us briefly examine, then, the development of the nation-state during this era.

The Germany that emerged from the war was to make an attempt to establish a western-type democracy. In 1918, therefore, the Republic of Germany was set up by the Social Democrat party. In 1919, after the election of the National Assembly, the deputies met in the town of Weimar to draft a constitution for the Republic. The constitution provided for a chief executive, the president, to be elected for seven years by popular vote. The executive was appointed by him, both being responsible to the Reichstag or parliament. A second chamber, the Reichsrat was also elected by the people, but it was representative of the eighteen states of the union which formed a federated commonwealth. The prerogatives of these states were reduced, thus making the central government even more powerful. This was the form which the republic took during its thirteen years of life.

The period of the Weimar Republic produced near disaster for the German nation. By the Treaty of Versailles, Germany was to pay reparations for the war costs of her conquerors, to the tune of an irrational 132,000,000,000 gold marks. The nation was deeply in debt, inflation had struck

LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

the value of the mark, and the German government had been printing great quantities of money. Toward the end of 1922 the nation was bankrupt, but the French who stood to gain the most from the war reparations invaded the Ruhr Valley to collect first hand. Having discovered that it cost more to keep the Ruhr than they collected, the French gave way to a British proposal for an economic study of the situation. Under the Dawes Plan [1] order was restored by a reconstruction of the value of the mark and a lowering of the reparations demands. From this point on, until the depression, Germany made a rapid recovery economically, and on the political front worked toward a strong national democracy.

But all was not well with the nation. Malcontents who despised the Republic for acceding to the demands of the Versailles Treaty fumed and fomented on the political backstages. With the depression of 1929, and the Republic's inability to cope with the problems arising out of it, these radical parties began their advance. "The success fell to a new-risen body of nationalists who had the acumen to combine with a fervent nationalism a social program alluring alike to the impoverished small bourgeoisie and to the harassed starving workers." 2) This was the National Socialist (Nazi) Party, which under the leadership of Adolph

---

1) Dawes was an American who headed the committee.
2) Schevill Ibid p. 790.

Hitler formed the largest party group in the Reichstag elections of 1932. In January 1933, Hitler was called upon to be Chancellor, and in April of that year after new elections gave his party a small majority, Hitler was given dictatorial power in the nation.

Thus began the Third Reich, an empire in the line of the Holy Roman Empire, and the Bismarckian empire of 1871-1918. Immediately, all political opponents were silenced by being taken to concentration camps, or driven out. The labor unions were dissolved and placed under a single leader of Nazi training, Dr. Ley. Only one political party, the Nazi Party, was allowed to exist. The historic federalism of the nation was replaced by a growing totalitarian central government. "Like the Fascists, the Nazis proclaimed the totalitarian state, which exists for its own sake and to which the action of the individual citizen must in all circumstances be subordinated. The totalitarian state is consciously and sharply opposed to the democratic state, with its inalienable individual rights of free speech, free press, and freedom of assembly." 3) To implement absolute control of the state, the Gestapo or secret police was created to keep watch on every possibility of insurrection. Throughout the land youth organizations loyal to the Nazis were created to provide a progeny of state supporters. In direct defiance of the Versailles treaty, the Nation began

---

3) Ibid p. 794.

to rearm openly, and in 1935 rejected the military terms of the Treaty. A navy and air-force were begun the same year, and in 1936 German troops occupied the Rhineland. From this point forward Hitler embarked upon unrestrained aggression which finally produced the Second World War.

Post-war Germany was a divided nation. The conquerors in this war did not stop at the borders to haggle over truce terms, but carried the offensive through every part of the land. The nation was partitioned among the four conquering allies, Russia, Britain, the United States, and Russia. Though a western hope for a united nation existed, the Russians began at once to establish a communist puppet regime in their zone of the country. By the end of 1946 it became apparent to the three other nations that they must provide some sort of home government for the rest of Germany, or abandon it to the communist influences. Delegates appointed by local governments of the western sector came together to draft a new constitution for the government in Bonn. A federal instrument was created made up of a house of the people, the Bundestag, and a house of the small states, the Bundesrat. A president, for ceremonial duties, was the nominal head of state. The Chancellor was elected by the Bundestag to head up the executive branch of the government responsible to the house. Though restrained by the occupying powers, this step provided a measure of autonomy for the German nation. In the twelve years since its inception, the Bonn Republic has prospered and taken its place

among the nations of western Europe. The East German Republic in this time also had advanced, and has been granted relative freedom within the Russian satellite state system.

Italy perhaps, should have been considered first in this group because of her early espousal of a totalitarian regime. The roots of this development lay in the war. Lured into the war at the side of the allies by the golden promises of reward, Italy came out of the war a hungry, bankrupt nation. What little wealth there had been, was dissipated, and the rewards offered little consolation to hungry men. The disruptive radical elements, in the land, socialists,Marxists, and communists, were making the picture even worse. In this disintegration Benito Mussolini began to organize the Fascist Party, a nationalistic union-minded movement. By 1922 the party had gained enough power that it marched on Rome and ousted the feeble government.

The dictatorship that was set up was purely and simply a totalitarian centralized regime. After control of the lower house was confirmed, laws flooded out for the perpetuation of the Fascist state. "Strikes to enforce economic demands were forbidden; the press was subjected to the strictest surveillance, "seditious persons" (meaning opponents of the regime) were exposed to arbitrary arrest and indefinite confinement; local officials were to be no longer freely elected but, in the interest of a tightened

centralization, appointed by the government; and, as a crowning measure, all political parties, except the Fascist party, were dissolved." 4) A highly centralized nation-state was thus formed.

In the late 1920's after the takeover of labor unions, and the reorganization of labor and management, the basis of government was changed. Thirteen confederated Fascist syndicates were created. Six went to employers, six to the employees, and one to lawyers, doctors and other professional people. There were local and national units of these corporations, to whom was assigned the right to draw up contracts between the production partners. In 1930 the idea was extended to government level by replacing universal suffrage with election of the government by these syndicates. The national assembly was resolved into a new chamber of four hundred corporation members, whose members were elected from a list presented by the Grand Council of the Fascist party. It was a government absolutely controlled from the top.

Following the war, a weak republic was re-established that has gone through a great number of ministries. since its inception in 1941. Though republican and democratic, the major difficulty has been the multiplicity of political parties that dominate the scene. The result is a national government that is ineffective and in constant danger of falling prey to another dictatorship or to communism.

---

4) Ibid p. 778

Spain, after World War I, was a nominal constitutional monarchy. By 1923, after successive setbacks in North Africa, the constitutional element was succeeded by a fascist-like dictatorship under Primo de Rivera. Rivera's dictatorship was not based upon a popular following, and he was not unscrupulous enough to crush opposition, so that by 1930 he gave up his position. The democratic constitution was restored immediately by his successor. The republicans that won the election the following year, demanded the abdication of the king who answered by flight. A republican government was then established in December 1931 by a constitution which provided for personal liberty, the separation of church and state, and the nationalizing of church property. Certain anti-clerical elements demanded severe measures against the Catholic church in 1932. The Jesuits were banned, their schools and other properties were confiscated, and all clergymen were deprived of their state salary. All ecclesiastical property was transferred to the state in 1933, and all congregations were required to pay taxes. A reaction began the same year, however, and the radical republicans were turned out of office in favor of a more moderate group. During the following three years this reaction continued while the more radical groups stirred up the country to chaotic conditions.

Suddenly, on July 19, 1936, General Francisco Franco landed in Spain from North Africa and called for a rising of the Right against the communist backed leftists. This marked the beginning of an alliance between Franco and the fascist

states of Italy and Germany, and a long civil war. By 1939 the conquest of the peninsula was completed by the General, and a fascist dictatorship was established. Various modifications have come during the intervening twenty years such as provision for the restoration of the monarchy and the righting of the differences with the church.

Indeed, General Franco began a restoration of the church's influence immediately. In September 1936, religious teaching in the Nationalist schools was made obligatory. In 1937 an image of the Virgin and a Crucifix were ordered for every school. Attendance at Mass on the festival days was made compulsory for school students and staffs and the Gospels were to be read at least once a week. Everywhere in Nationalist territories the influence of the Roman Catholic church permeated once again. "No ceremony, academic or political, could take place without some form of religious observance." 5) From that time on, most major political changes were announced or enacted on feast or holy days, thus giving the state an aura of religious revival. The hold of the church upon the state still continues.

Europe in the four decades after World War I was not dominated by the totalitarian states, however. France, Britain, and many smaller states, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden maintained their democratic traditions. Credit for this has been given to the strong

---

5) Peers, E.A. Spain in Eclipse p.117.

democratic forces at work in the major states, France and Britain, for in maintaining their historic institutions these two powers gave the necessary incentives to the smaller states.

But it was not all light and power for these states. France began the era rebuilding a nation shattered by war. The republican government which had carried the country through the war was given a vote of confidence in 1919, thereupon beginning the national renewal. But by the 1924 elections, the Ruhr fiasco had produced a shift in party politics and the Left Cartel came into power. Herein began a movement of shifting party spirit, of splinter parties, and general parliamentary unrest. Only the return of Poincaré in 1926 for three years made possible a relative stability. After his retirement, however, fascist, communist, and other revolutionary movements sprang into the undisciplined breaches of the government. Conditions became ripe for a takeover such as Hitler and Mussolini staged. At this point a new power bloc, the National Front, was organized under Léon Blum to combat the radical elements. The French state was at its best here, providing labor legislation, rights of collective bargaining, and many other statutes suggestive of F.D. Roosevelt's New Deal legislation. The Popular Front movement was preserved until 1938, but by 1939 the situation was at such a point of disintegration that parliament practically abdicated its sovereignty granting rule by decree foreight months to the premier's cabinet. In September of 1939 war broke out once

again smashing the republic. In 1945 the republican democracy sprang into existence once again. Until the creation of a new Republic under the leadership of Charles De Gaulle in 1958, the same disruptive party splinters continued to harass France with ever changing governments. Schevill makes a pointed summary of French democracy when he says:

> . . . The revealed and recognized weakness of the republic lay in the parliament, and the weakness of the parliament was the large number of parties that composed it. Never did it happen that a single party by itself embraced a majority of the deputies. It followed that ministries were regularly constituted by a coalition of parties, or by what the French called a bloc. And it also followed that the moment some particularly contentious issue arose, the bloc went to pieces, the ministry fell, and a new bloc had somehow to be fashioned for the support of a new ministry. Government in these circumstances was in perpetual flux and dangerously unstable. 6)

Meanwhile in Great Britain, having had a century more of democratic procedure than France, the government was in a very much more secure position in the decades of this period. The two party system was the basis of British politics, thus guaranteeing one party a working majority in the Commons. The elections of 1922 witnessed the growth of the Labor party, a split in the popular vote, and no party in command of a solid majority. But in 1924 the Conservatives were returned with a triumphant majority. In the 1929 general elections a similar split vote occured as in 1922, that was corrected by a conservative victory in 1931. From that time forward the original opposition, the Liberals, faded from the political scene, and

---

6) Ibid, p. 806.

the Labor party became the official opposition until World War II began. The disappearance of the Liberals restored the time honored two-party system.

This period also witnessed the extension of suffrage to all adults over twenty-one years of age. The basis of government henceforth rested upon the broadest foundation possible, the people as a whole.

As far as the nation state was concerned, this should conclude the treatment of Great Britain. However, a new concept of world relationships and national states came into existence upon the foundation laid in the British Empire. We noticed earlier that many of Britain's colonies had been granted independence and self-government in the nineteenth century. In the last forty years, this movement has gone on at an accelerated pace. Ireland, India, Egypt, Pakistan have all gained new independent status among the nations of the world. Many of these states have sought to maintain some connection with the British government. Imperial conferences were held among the nations owing some allegiance to Britain. Finally in 1926 at one of these conferences it was declared that: " Great Britain and the dominions are autonomous communities within the British empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another . . . though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." 7) In 1931 this declaration was

---

7) Ibid p. 819.

embodied in British law by the Statute of Westminster, and has proved a basis for world wide participation in affairs of common interest. In recent years the Commonwealth has grown through the addition of new members as they have gained national status.

The history of the United States may be treated in a very summary fashion. After World War I ended, the U.S. retreated into isolation once again, avoiding all ties with the problems of Europe. Only the World War II attack of Pearl Harbor brought the Americans back into the world scene and leadership. Since 1945 her position has been the bulwark of democracy against communist imperialism around the world with varying degrees of success.

Internally democracy is the dominant feature of the state relationship, but a chequered battle has raged during the last fifteen years on the segregation issue. The battle lines are drawn as court injunctions, "sit-in" strikes, and other measures are adopted to demolish the forces of segregation. But prejudice is a slowly-defeated enemy, and it will be a considerable time before the race prejudice vanishes as religious and national hatreds have waned.

World War I ended in 1917 for the emerging Bolshevik Russia. An upheaval of vast import was gripping the country, and the newly formed government led by the communists wished peace on her borders to consolidate the gains of the revolution. In the next five years, the convulsions of 1917 spread through-

out the country until the forces of Lenin were at last victorious.

The nation-state government which was established as a consequence was an highly powerful dictatorship based upon a small segment of the population. The government's source of strength and authority was the Red army, and the Cheka, a secret-police which was empowered to kill anyone opposing the new regime. As soon as order and security were achieved the Bolshevika began to reorganize the country. Seven different national groups were recognized in the nation, and each was organized into a soviet socialist republic. The union of these several states gave the name to the country - the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) The towns, cities and republics were governed by soviets, or organizations of workers, right up to the Union Congress level of government. But since the Congress was too unwieldy with over two-thousand members, the authority of the Congress was delegated to the Union Central Executive Committee. An elective process provided the members for all these soviets, giving the process a fairly democratic character.

This surface appearance is deceptive, however. No party other than the Communist party was allowed to exist. The party was dominated by a committee of supreme political power, the Politburo, which drafted the policy of the government. The party itself which was organized into "cells" at the local, regional and national level, had at best only, two percent of

the population. The Politburo which drew leadership and ideas from the party, also used the party to carry out the measures which it advocated. Other sources of strength, the Red army and the Cheka were modified and expanded over the years, but kept under the control of the Politburo.

At the top of the government and communist party was a supreme dictator - "the man who, through his personal influence and with the aid of revolutionary tribunal, red army, censorship, and party discipline, could actually rule as few despots in history have been able to rule." 8) In the history of Russia since the Revolution this position has been held by Lenin (d.1924) and Stalin (d.1954), two of the most powerful figures on the modern Russian scene.

* * * *

---

8) Hayes, C.J.H., A Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe, p. 678.

The Nazi conquest of Germany in 1933 laid the foundation of a struggle between the state and church that continued until the fall of the Third Reich. The conflict centred in the contest between the state-dominated Reich church and the right of the Confessing church to organize itself independently. Only the definition of the boundaries of church and state could settle the problem, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer attempted to set the limits of each in three essays.

In his first essay, the young theologian describes the state and church as two forms of the Kingdom of God on earth, and their interrelatedness. The church is the kingdom of the resurrection miracle which provides man with the victory over evil and death; the state is the Kingdom of order which gives man law, community and history. Neither can stand alone. The church limits the state and the state limits the church, and one must never try to become the other. Since man is called to the Kingdom of God, he must live in both spheres obediently, remembering the limits of each.

The second essay, "What Is Church?" elaborates the church's responsibility in the state. It must be concerned with politics, yet remain apolitical. He indicates the state's limit of power and action: "The first word is not "christianization of politics", but "politics within a finite context", and this releases the church from party politics and places it in the genuine political sphere free from party

allegiance". 9) The second area of responsibility would hinge on the use of direct political action in the sphere of politics. Only where there was a definite command from God could the church engage in political activity. The question then to be considered was whether this whould be through existing parties or a new party. Bonhoeffer did not answer this question but indicated the possibilities only.

"The Church Before the Jewish Question", Bonhoeffer's third essay, examines the state and legal action. The church must constantly ask, "Is the state fulfilling its responsiblity in providing justice, order, and its duties as a state?" If not, it loses its "raison d'etre," and three proposals are made by Bonhoeffer for action that the church might take against the state: 1. Challenge the state on its legitimacy of action and ask for correction of abuses; 2. The church may help victims of the state, whether members or not; 3. The church may throw itself into the "wheel of state" when the state is not acting as the state should.

On the first two measures the church acted at once, but the third action was not undertaken until the Barmen Confessional Synod met in 1934. At Dahlem the incongruity of the Reich church was again repudiated and the German Confessional church was established. The division, which on the surface appeared interconfessional, was a struggle against the state, complicated by the inter-church conflict. The

---

9) Godsey, The Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, p. 109

result was a continued split between Confessing and state-church Christians. The Confessing church refused to recognize state-appointed administrators, setting up its own order instead. The cleavage, thus established, continued throughout the war years. And Bonhoeffer, who was the spokesman for the Confessing church, took part in an unconstitutional attempt to smash the power of the state. After an unsuccessful attempt on Hitler's life in July 1944, Bonhoeffer and other conspirators were imprisoned and executed. "Someone had to risk throwing himself into the spokes of an insanely driven "wheel of state," not only for the sake of the church, but for all the people of a war-torn world." 10)

Bonhoeffer's position during the state-church struggle may be summarized in the following statements:

> a. The kingdom of God on earth assumes form in the church and in the state.
> b. Church and state are separate, in that each performs a different function within the divine economy, but are necessarily interrelated, in that one cannot properly exist without the other.
> c. The German Church Struggle arose when the Nazi state attempted to "co-ordinate" the evangelical church; therefore, it was not essentially directed against the Nazi state as such, but the state's interference in the life of the church.
> d. By interfering with the life and work of the church, the state is denying its own essence as a state, for the state has the God-given task of preserving order, so that the church may proclaim the gospel.
> e. The church can have but one Lord; therefore, the German Christians, who have accepted the lordship of the Nazi state, have expelled themselves from the church and have thereby relinquished all fellowship.
> f. The attack on the church from the outside has

---

10) Ibid, p.118.

> led to a state of confession in which church order is no longer adiaphorous, but a matter of confession. Therefore, there can be no obedience to or relationship with any church organs established by the state, but only with the organs established by the church itself.
> g. The church must never become so preoccupied with its "strange work" of deciding its limits and fighting about church order that it neglects its "proper work" of proclaiming the gospel and building up the Christian community.
> h. The church struggle can end only when the state ceases its interference in the life of the church, i. e., when the state carries out its proper function as state and thus allows the church to be the church. 11)

Political thought on this continent came alive during the present period through the work and writings of Reinhold Niebuhr. In many books, essays, and articles, Niebuhr developed a practical political philosophy for the democratic nations, and a substantial critique of the communist ideology.

His view of the state rests upon a deep understanding of the nature of man. Because of man's sin, democracy is the only system that makes sure that man is never entrusted with irresponsible power over his fellows. "Man's capacity for justice makes democracy possible; but man's inclination to injustice makes democracy necessary." 12) The liberal view of man's essential goodness cannot stand in the reality of life. The sinfulness and power-seeking attitude of man must be kept constantly balanced in the state, "For democracy is a method of finding proximate solutions for insoluble problems." 13) Primarily, Niebuhr's concern in this area

---

11) Ibid p. 118.
12) Niebuhr, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness p.11
13) Ibid p. 118

is that man's nature be reckoned with, and that this is best done by a system which limits the power of the ruling group.

Niebuhr's second major emphasis is that of community. There is a constant tension between the individual and the community as the group provides both fulfillment for the individual and frustration. But individualism and the collectivism are not absolute things in any sense. Man is endowed with the desire for the community and his own independence. It is this factor which also makes democracy imperative, for only democracy can dispense justice to the individual without disturbing the solidarity of the community.

Beyond the individual, the community is the source which produces a centre for the community's welfare, the government. It is the sole responsibility of the government to manipulate the forces of the nation to prevent conflict and to right injustices wherever they may occur. To prevent the government itself from becoming an agency of authoritorianism, the principle of balances must be employed once again. "Her majesty's loyal opposition", is the best example of this balance against the governmental power. "Justice is as dependent upon the responsible control of governmental power as it is upon the power of government to redress the disbalances of power throughout society." 14) The government possesses power limited by its opposition. But it also rules by the reality and the pretension of "majesty", as Niebuhr describes it. It is in some way a gift from God, but always

---

14) Harland, <u>The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr</u> p. 174.

under divine judgement. Under God then, two aspects of government may be seen, justice and judgement. One presents a principle of order and prevents anarchy; the other shows that it cannot associate its power with divine power. "Democracy is not an absolute. On the contrary, it is conceived in the light of the one absolute wherein is revealed the height of man's freedom, and the corruption of that freedom, which makes democracy both possible and necessary." 15)

Niebuhr has done considerable thinking on the nature of Communism - most of which has been gathered together in one essay "Why is Communism so Evil?" Four major attitudes of Communist doctrine help to produce the evil which distinguishes this system. The first is the monopoly of power which the state enjoys in this system. "Disproportions of power anywhere in the human community are fruitful of injustice, but a system which gives some men absolute power over other men results in evils which are worse than injustice". 16) Under the Communist system the power is gathered into the party, the party's executive and finally at the top a tyrannical dictator. The result is injustice greater than that which inspired Marx's revolt against free society.

The second challenge registered against Communism is its utopianism which aims at the unreachable classless society. The utopian ideal is as evil as it is dangerous because it provides an artificial moral facade for the most unscrupulous

---

15) Ibid p. 175.
16) Niebuhr - Christian Realism and Political Problems, p.40

political policies. The present historical processes are destroyed, and many human values with them, in the pursuit of the distant goal.

Niebuhr's third criticism of communism is the belief that the proletarian revolution can change the course of history and even the human situation. Man ceases in this event to be the creature as he becomes creator, with power to create, foresee the future and force things into his mold. It produces an unqualified faith in man, and "this tendency of playing God to human history is the cause for a great deal of communist malignancy." 17) There has been difficulty in the camp of these oligarchs, however, as they find history and man to be more confusing and stubborn than anticipated.

The last source of evil in communism is the dogmatic interpretation of history which does not take account of the facts. On this basis also, any deviation from dogma is branded as treason, the traitors already molded by some force such as 'bourgeois-nationalist' origin. There is complete irrationality at many points resulting in a disastrous conformity.

Niebuhr sums up the argument against communism thus:" . . the evil of communism flows from a combination of political and 'spiritual' factors which prove that the combination of power and pride is responsible for turning the illusory dreams of yesterday into the present nightmare, which disturbs the ease of millions of men in our generation." 18)

---

17) Ibid, p. 45.
18) Ibid, p. 47.

The thought of John C. Bennett on the nature of the state is not unlike that of Niebuhr. The state is organized with coercive powers for the maintenance of internal order, to act as judge between conflicting interests, to punish crime, and to safeguard the nation from external enemies. The state has the right of life and death over its citizens, but a tolerable state will limit this power. Mainly, however, the state exists to provide fundamental services for its constituent members. Through coercive measures, but more important, by the consent of the people, these rights and obligations are provided.

In the area of the nature of the state, Bennett also considers the element of sin, and its effect upon men's condition as governor and governed. In relation to the symptoms of man's sin, the state is seen in three ways:
1. It actively works to prevent crime and the antisocial tendencies of the citizen. The prevention of anarchy and the maintenance of the balance of powers within the state is of prime importance. 2. The state's power, and misuse of this power, is a second symptom of man's sinfulness. Power itself is morally neutral in that it can be used for good or for evil. The best type of state then, is one that distributes the sources of power to prevent misuse of it.
3. It must deal with the corporateness of man's sin in society, i.e., the corruption in and out of government. It is apparent then, that man must be protected by the state from others in the state who would act for self; from the state

acting for its own self interest; and from man himself in his individual and corporate sin.

Bennett goes on to discuss the rule of the state as a protector of all as in the welfare state. He is not sure whether the welfare state is the answer to man's problems, but he does say that this is one way a community shows its concern for its members. Social services, children's allowances, old-age pensions are all examples of the community, represented by the state, seeking to aid its members.

In a particular instance, the struggle of the state for equality among its citizens is demonstrated by the actions of the United States Supreme Court against segregated schools. Though the victory against slavery was presumably won a century ago, the struggle goes on for full equality of black and white. By demanding integration of schools, the state is acting justly for its citizens. Regarding crime and punishment, there appear to be new developments in state procedure which would indicate a new evaluation of man's value in the life of the community. Bennett indicates that this new rationale for action lifts the state's purpose from retributive justice to active rehabilitation of the offenders.

We are looking at the state that is democratic, has no state church associated with it, and through the action of its citizens is quite progressive. This is not the total picture. The British democracy has an established church relationship just as Norway had during World War II. From his position as primate of the Norwegian church, Bishop Eivind Berggrav made some illuminating comments about the state

while imprisoned by the Nazis. His church was driven to fight the usurper and invader, and for this reason he looks for political views to oppose totalitarianism. Thus the state should be rooted in the conscience of the community, in a federal scheme which gives the best opportunity of releasing man's "vital energies". He says in summary: "In all of this, however, the state can only be an external, a regulating and ministering factor, like the ordnance department of an army. Even if the state on its part declared itself obliged to take an interest in those values which are related to the sanctity of law, freedom of conviction, and freedom of worship, for example; this would not make the state part owner, still less, the final authority, in the creative life of these vitally important, key factors." 19)

In the case of Archbishop Temple and the established church of England there has been a different form of agitation. He emphasizes that the state has no right to prescribe how a man should be educated nor should it attempt to regulate aesthetic appreciation or creativity. He does approve of a close tie of church and state but only if the church is granted its essential liberty. Basically the state has a right to a voice in political activities only, but the church as well as all other non-political ventures should be left alone.

---

19) Ibid, p. 78.

We have already considered the emphasis of the Church of Rome in Spain, where a very close association exists between the church and state. In many respects this intimate band validates the strictest Roman Catholic position on the relation of church and state. It is not, however, the only position to emerge from Roman Catholic writers during this period.

A Frenchman, Jacques Maritain, draws a complex picture of society, community and the individual. The state, for Maritain, is the part of society which "specializes in the interests of the whole." Its primary concern is "the maintenance of law, the promotion of the common welfare and public order, and the administration of public affairs." 20) As such the state is not the head of the political society but an instrument of it. Combined with a democratic philosophy, this concept makes the state useful only when it serves the individual person, provides social justice, and stimulates freedom in the intellect and cultural life. Though a Frenchman, Maritain's ideas are more akin to the British or American types of democracy.

It is Father John Courtney Murray, an American Jesuit, however, who speaks most frankly for the American democracy. His position is nearly the same as Maritain's, but is not so well developed. The state, though it is an aspect of the perfect society, community, nation or people, is not identical with any one of them. At best, the state is a legal association

---

20) Maritain, Man and the State, p. 12.

for limited purposes. It is established by law, limited by law and carries out its functions under legal rules. John Bennett sums up Father Murray's position with a number of propositions:

> The state in this country is by its very nature limited . . . There is no anti-clerical or anti-religious motivation behind the American constitutional provision for Church-State relations and the Church need not defend itself against this doctrine as such.
>
> It is important to emphasize the rights of the state in its own sphere, the freedom of the church from state control, and the influence of Catholic citizens on the state.
>
> It is impossible to separate religious freedom from civil freedom and there can be no democracy if the freedom of the citizen is curtailed in religious matters, for such curtailing can often take place as a means of silencing political dissent.
>
> Errors do not have the same rights as truth but persons in error, consciences in error, do have rights which sould be respected by the Church and the state.
>
> The church should not demand that the state as the secular arm enforce the Church's own decisions in regard to heresy.
>
> It does more harm than good to the Church for the state to use its power against non-Catholics. 21)

---

21) Bennett, Ibid, p. 266.

CONCLUSION

Our survey of the development of the nation-state under God has shown that there are three distinct varieties in the present day. The first is the totalitarian regime which rejects God completely and makes man merely a tool for the well-being of the state as in the communist bloc countries explicitly or in the Nazi or Fascist states implicitly. The second group takes religion seriously, but maintains a rigid control of man in the state under a totalitarian system, as in Spain. The third group, the democratic nations, places an emphasis upon free conscience in religion, and a man's ultimate worth in the eyes of the law and community. There are variations, of course, in this general pattern, not only because of the state, but because of the theological considerations upon which the state rests. In the west, we naturally assume that democracy is the answer because our form of government makes great demands upon a citizen, but guarantees the most in terms of personal freedom and dignity.

But what of the future? What is to be the nature of the nation-state in the years ahead? The fifteen years since World War II have seen the advent of many new states in the world. Some of these have had a long cultural history, such as India and Ceylon, and must now spend time constructing states to promote their national interests. Other states are mere paper entities which have emerged as the result of arbitrary historical circumstance or a vague nationalism, such

as in the Congo, Ghana, or Nigeria. The forces which have caused those of very different tribal backgrounds to develop into national federations often seem to be a negative anti-colonialism, rather than a forceful nationalism. Each one of these new states now is trying to establish stable political structures that will stand the pressures of modern politics and economics.

In many ways, the most recent developments seem to indicate that the era of the sovereign and independent nation-state is over. Modern modes of travel, of war, and of economic developments are beginning to make it apparent that man can no longer exist in the splendid isolation of a small community. The United States' entry into World Wars I and II illustrates this very nicely. Something bigger than the nation may have to evolve to meet this need. Between the two great wars the League of Nations attempted to establish some sort of world government to deal with the problems of the nations. It failed, because no nation was willing to forego any of its sovereign rights. Following the last war, the United Nations was begun as a second attempt to meet the needs of a divided world community. Like the League of Nations, the United Nations has had failure also, but it has had many successes. Some of the organs of the League such as health, banking, and justice have carried on through both organizations providing a substantial service for all nations. It may be that the relative success of these organizations may help the stature of the parent body in its struggle for effective world organization.

For in the world of inter-continental rockets, of imminent space travel, and atomic bombs, mankind can go on in either of two directions. It can adopt some sane, responsible form of world rule in which all nations give up some sovereign rights for the good of all; or it can go on in the insane race for armaments, building up two major power blocs in the world which could result in global conquest by a totalitarian victor. In either case, it seems that the nation-state is but a stage in the development of an international community. Perhaps the new economic-political development of the European Common Market may prove to be a model for such a global structure. If it does, much time and patience will be required for the working out of the various forms.

But under God, what is the future of the nation-state and future political developments? It is obvious that any structure which does not grant every man dignity, respect and the right to life is already under the judgement of God. The fact of the incarnation clearly and finally indicates God's concern for his creation, and also provides the indictment against any form of injustice. If the nation-state cannot allow for an opportunity for all men in the world to grow to the stature that God expects, then some other development must take place. But a world community would be judged by the same criterion, and where lacking could fall under a similar condemnation. The justice of God and his mercy, then, are the determining factors in any state that now continues, or that will emerge in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bainton, R.N., Here I Stand, Abingdon-Cokesbury, New York, 1950.

2. Bennett, John C., Christians and the State, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1958.

3. Bettenson, Henry, Documents of the Christian Church, Oxford University Press, London, 1953.

4. Brentano, Francis, Nation under God, Channel Press, New York, 1957.

5. Bury, J.P.T., The New Cambridge Modern History, V.X, Cambridge at the University Press, 1960.

6. Davis, H.W.C., Medieval Europe, Williams and Nogate, London.

7. Fremantle, Anne, The Papal Encyclicals, The New American Library, New York, 1958.

8. Grimm, H.J., The Reformation Era, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1954.

9. Harland, Gordon, The Thought of Reinhold Niebuhr, Oxford University Press, New York, 1960.

10. Hayes, C.J.H., Modern Europe to 1870, Macmillan Co., New York, 1953.

11. Hutchins, R.M., Great Books of the Western World, 23 & 35, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Toronto, 1952.

12. Kegley, C.W., Bretall, R.W., Reinhold Niebuhr - His Religious, Social and Political Thought, Macmillan Co., New York, 1956.

13. Machiavelli, The Prince, A Mentor Book, Oxford Press, 1959.

14. Mackinnon, James, Calvin and the Reformation, Longmans, Green, and Co., London, 1936.

15. Maritain, Jacques, Man and the State, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951.

16. Nichols, J.H., History of Christianity 1650-1950, The Roland Press Co., New York, 1953.

17. Palmer, R.R., A History of the Modern World, Alfred A Knopf, New York, 1958.

18. Peers, E.A., Spain in Eclipse 1937-1943, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London, 1943.

19. Pirenne, H., A History of Europe, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1955.

20. Schevill, F., A History of Europe, Harcourt, Brace & Co., New York, 1951.

21. Smith, Preserved, Martin Luther, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1911.

22. Thatcher, O.J., & McNeale E.H., A Source Book For Medieval History, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1907.

23. Tillich, Paul, A History of Christian Thought, Paul Tillich Copyright, New York, 1956.

24. Troeltsch, E., The Social Teachings of the Christian Church, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1949.

25. Walker, Williston, A History of the Christian Church, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1952.

26. Whale, J.S., The Protestant Tradition, Cambridge at the University Press, 1955.

B29793